

VOL. XLV, 4

WHOLE No. 180

THE
AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK,
WILFRED P. MUSTARD, D. M. ROBINSON

OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER
1924

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.—Lucan's <i>Pharsalia</i> . By R. B. STEELE,	301
II.—The Doctrine of Caesura, A Philological Ghost. By E. H. STURTEVANT,	329
III.—Notes on Aristotle's 'Rhetoric.' By W. RHYS ROBERTS,	351
IV.—Ptolemy's <i>Skandia</i> . By KEMP MALONE,	362
V.—A Supposed Historical Discrepancy in the Platonic Epistles. By L. A. POST,	371
VI.—The Indefinite First Singular. By H. C. NUTTING,	377
REPORTS:	380
Hermes, Vol. LVIII (1923), Nos. 3 and 4 (HERMAN L. EBELING).—Romania, Vol. XLIX (GEORGE C. KEIDEL).	
REVIEWS:	387
<i>Diels's</i> T. Lucreti Cari de rerum natura (W. A. MERRILL).— <i>Von Duhn's</i> Italische Gräberkunde (LILY ROSS TAYLOR).— <i>Rothstein's</i> Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius; <i>Hosius's</i> Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV; <i>Sabbadini's</i> Giovanni da Ravenna; <i>Shipley's</i> Velleius Paterculus (W. P. MUSTARD).	
CORRESPONDENCE,	397
ERRATUM,	397
BOOKS RECEIVED,	398
INDEX,	401

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 50 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLV, 4

WHOLE No. 180

I.—LUCAN'S *PHARSALIA*.

Among the participants in a conspiracy against Nero in 65 A. D. was Marcus Annaeus Lucanus who attempted to free himself from blame by accusing his innocent mother. Unsuccessful in this he was given his choice in kinds of death, and chose to die by opening his veins. A poetical work of his, the *Pharsalia*, such is the tradition, was retouched and published by his uncle, the philosopher Seneca, who was shortly to die in the same way. The work was received with favor both by the critics and by the public. Quintilian says of him (10, 1, 90): Lucanus ardens et concitatus et sententiis clarissimus et, ut dicam quod sentio, magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus. The extent of his influence is suggested by Martial (14, 194):

Sunt quidam qui me dicant non esse poetam:

Sed qui me vendit bybliopola putat.

His standing was high also among the commentators who frequently refer to him in their comments on the earlier poets.

Although I have not had the experience, I can imagine that the acme of exhilaration on the part of the poet is the moment when he realizes that immortality is to be his, and proclaims the assured fact to the world. Lucan had this confidence in full measure (9, 980 ff.):

O sacer et magnus vatum labor, omnia fato
Eripis et populis donas mortalibus aevum.
Invidia sacrae, Caesar, ne tangere famae;
Nam, si quid Latii fas est promittere Musis,
Quantum Zmyrnaei durabunt vatis honores,
Venturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra
Vivet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aevo.

Homer and Lucan in one breath! But there were for Homer poetical realities that had perished for Lucan. "Sing, O Muse, Achilles' baneful wrath" sang Homer, and it is at least a pleasant fiction to think of the Muse directing the pen of a writer. But for Lucan the Muses were dead. He begins with the declaration

Bella per Emathios plus quam civilia campos,
Iusque datum sceleri canimus,

and a similar neglect of the Muses is shown in his address to Nero (1, 66):

Tu satis ad vires Romana in carmina dandas.

He then continues with

Fert animus causas tantarum expromere rerum,

combining a part of Ovid (*Metam.* 1, 1):

In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas
Corpora,

and also of *Fasti* (3, 725):

Carminis huius opus causas expromere. . . .

For Homer the gods moved among men, and though they be but larger forms, yet they gave an elevation to his song that is not to be found in the *Pharsalia*. Shadowy and unsubstantial as they may have really been, they were still poetical realities for Vergil, as for Homer, but by the time of Lucan they had vanished from the thoughts of men. Without the Muses and the gods Lucan took on himself the task of breathing the breath of poetic life into a narrative of the actions of men. How far he may have drawn his material from Livy, or any other earlier writer, is of little moment, for actual reproduction would have meant but another history. Of far more moment are the poetical influences which affected him, and vice versa the influence which he had on those who followed him. Epic measures had been fixed by Vergil, and lyric strains by Horace, and he freely incorporated their vibrant notes in his own song.

I. ADAPTED MATERIAL.

There is a decided Senecan element in the *Pharsalia*, but of more interest are the suggestions and adaptations from the earlier master-builders of verse. This fact does not need extended proof, but rather illustrations from which can be seen his psychic attitude and his poetic method. Adaptations from Ovid make up the first line of the poem, while the statement (*Metam.* 4, 617):

Cumque super Libycas victor penderet harenas,
Gorgonei capitis guttae cecidere cruentae,
Quas humus exceptas varios animavit in angues;
Unde frequens illa est infestaque terra colubris,

is expanded by Lucan (9, 619-699). The fight between Hercules and Antaeus is merely mentioned by Ovid (*Metam.* 9, 183), and may not have suggested the account in Lucan (4, 593-660). However, each can decide for himself in regard to the propriety of assigning the story to a *rudis incola* (*ib.* 592).

Vergil introduces Iopas as singer at the feast of Dido (*Aen.* 1, 740 ff.), and this suggested Acoreus telling of the sources of the Nile, but at much greater length (10, 194-331). Inasmuch as Aeneas received assistance from the Sibyl, it was eminently proper that Appius should consult the oracle at Delphi. The priestess bacchatur . . . per antrum (5, 169), just as the Sibyl in antro bacchatur (*Aen.* 6, 77). The answer of the priestess is more involved than that of the Sibyl, but properly interpreted foretold the death of Appius (*ib.* 196):

Effugis ingentes tanti discriminis experts
Bellorum, Romane, minas solusque quietem
Euboici vasta lateris convalle tenebis.

The scene might fitly end with this, but Lucan extends it with nearly forty lines chiding the god of prophecy.

More interesting than these suggested scenes are the little snatches of the song of other men which he has worked into the poem. These show the skill of the selector, and are a recognition of the merit of the originator. The incorporated parts were not out of harmony with the other parts. To use his own words there was no *concordia discors* (1, 98), and thus the

merit of the work of Lucan was proved. On two occasions (*Aen.* 2, 774; 3, 48) the hair of Aeneas stood on end—*steteruntque comae*—, and in the statement of the fact Vergil produced a marvel for orthodox grammarians, a short *e* in the ending of the perfect indicative. How neatly does Lucan improve on this (1, 193) with *riguere comae*! A part of Caesar's question (1, 345) *quae moenia fessis?* is what Aeneas asks of the gods (*Aen.* 3, 85). *Patuere doli* (4, 746; 5, 141) changes but one letter of Vergil's *latuere doli* (*Aen.* 1, 130). Lucan also has another variation (2, 1) *irae patuere deum*. Notice how nearly *pro lucri pallida tabes*! (4, 96) comes to, yet avoids, *auri sacra fames* (*Aen.* 3, 57). Pompey says *magna peregi* (5, 660), a suggestion from the words of Dido (*Aen.* 4, 653). The close resemblance of the following is worthy of note: *revocato sanguine* (8, 68) and *revocato a sanguine* (*Aen.* 1, 235); *quas gesserat olim* (9, 176) and *quod gesserat olim* (*Aen.* 1, 653). Compare also *accipe, numen . . . votorum extrema meorum* (8, 142) with (*Aen.* 3, 486):

*Accipe et haec, manuum tibi quae monumenta mearum
Sint cape dona extrema tuorum.*

The tone in Vergil's (*Aen.* 2, 354):

Una salus victis, nullam sperare salutem

is reproduced with variations in *una salus* (9, 379), *sola salus* (5, 575), as also in *spes una salutis* (2, 113; 5, 636). The words (3, 737):

*Ille caput labens et iam languentia colla
Viso patre levat,*

are suggested by the words of Vergil describing the death of Euryalus (*Aen.* 9, 435). The thought in *pati vel quae tristissima pulchrum* | *Romanumque putant*, strikes the same note as Vergil's *pulchrum mori* (*Aen.* 2, 317) and Horace's (*Odes* 3, 2, 13)

Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.

Aemula virtus (1, 121) is taken over from Horace (*Epodes* 16, 5), and there are a number of other adaptations, as, for example, *totus popularibus auris* | *Impelli* (1, 132), the negative of Horace (*Odes* 3, 2, 19-20):

Nec sumit aut ponit secures
Arbitrio popularis auræ.

The words (5, 37): *iacet hostis in undis* | *Obrutus Illyricis* is a transformation of *Odes* 1, 28, 23:

Illyricis Notus obruit undis,
just as the line (6, 75):

Distat ab excelsa nemoralis Aricia Roma
is suggested by *Sat.* 1, 5, 1:

Egressum magna me accepit Aricia Roma.

The words of Horace (*Odes* 1, 1, 18): *indocilis pauperiem pati*, are for metrical reasons slightly changed (5, 538) *indocilis privata loqui*. Compare also (3, 510):

. . . Non robore picto
Ornatas decuit fulgens tutela carinas,

with *Odes* 1, 14, 14: *Nil pictis timidus navita puppibus* | *Fidit*. The words assigned to Pompey (8, 266) *Non omnis in arvis* | *Emathiis cecidi*, adapt the famous words of Horace (*Odes* 3, 30, 6) *non omnis moriar*. The above quotations are fully sufficient to show the method of Lucan, and that he felt the need of brightening his song with the words of other bards.

II. ADAPTATIONS OF LUCAN.

The epic poets who followed Lucan made ample use of his words. For Silius, as we have shown elsewhere (*Class. Phil.* XVII, 319) Lucan stands on a par with Vergil. Valerius Flaccus and Statius also used the *Pharsalia* freely, yet with a difference in their methods. The case is concisely summed up by Baehrens, *Praefatio*, Val. Flac., p. viii: "Talibus in aemulationibus nescio an nullus poeta Romanus prudentius et, ut ita dicam, pudenter sese gesserit Valerio. Alii enim, ut Silius Italicus, interdum nimis anxie ac timide, alii, ut Statius, nimis callide ac paene fraudulenter Vergilii vestigia presserunt; certe de Statio rectissime ipsius verbis [*Achill.* I 60] a viro docto nescioquo dictum est eum vulpis instar delevisse pedum vestigia caudis." Statius tells us that he watched over the *Thebaid* for twelve years. If he worked regularly throughout the entire

period, the work could have been completed by finishing a sentence a day. Compare the differentiated statement in *Dialogus de Oratoribus* (9, 15): *Toto anno, per omnes dies, magna noctium parte unum librum excudit et elucubravit.* Under these conditions, it was possible for Statius to so metamorphose the words of his predecessors that little trace of the original remained.

1. *Valerius Flaccus.*

The collection by Baehrens shows a Vergilian reminiscence for every ten lines of Flaccus, and in the earlier part of the work, there is the same free use of Lucan. At times a suggestion from Vergil seems to have been utilized by Lucan, and was in turn taken from the latter by Flaccus. Vergil has a simile (*Aen.* 10, 272 ff.) containing a reference to Sirius:

Non secus ac liquida si quando nocte cometae
Sanguinei lugubre rubent aut Sirius ardor,
Ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus aegris,
Nascitur et laevo contristat lumine caelum.

Lucan has (10, 211) *rapidos qua Sirius ignes | Exerit*, while Flaccus adapts the same simile (1, 683 ff.; 5, 368 ff.), the latter passage having *asperat ignes | Sirius*, an adaptation of Lucan. Similar statements are also found elsewhere. The *Aeneid* begins with *cano*, but both Lucan and Flaccus have *canimus*. The words *praesaga mali mens* (*Aen.* 10, 843) are differently arranged and are placed by Flaccus at the beginning of the line (1, 693). In its association with *metus* it resembles the form in Lucan (9, 120): *in multo mens est praesaga timore*. Compare also *ferit retinacula ferro* (*Aen.* 4, 580), *abscidis frustra ferro tua pignora* (L. 3, 33) and *retinacula ferro | Abscidit* (Fl. 1, 488); *premit altum corde dolorem* (*Aen.* 1, 209); *prementem | corde metus ducit* (Fl. 1, 733); and *premit inde metus* (L. 7, 341).

The earlier use of some proper names by Lucan accounts for their appearance in Flaccus, as *Aricia* (L. 6, 75; Fl. 2, 305), *Inarime* (L. 5, 101; Fl. 3, 208), *Sesostris* (L. 10, 276; Fl. 5, 418). Compare also the reference to *Pallas* (L. 7, 149 ff.; Fl. 6, 173 ff.), and the names in L. 6, 388 ff. and Fl. 3, 65-66. Some adjective forms are also noticeable, *Inachius* (L. 4, 634;

Fl. 4, 397). In Lucan (7, 116) the Enipeus is *turbidus*, in Flaccus (1, 83) *tumidus*. Gortyna sagittis (L. 3, 186) is like Gortyna pharetris (Fl. 1, 708), as are the references to Peuce (L. 3, 202; Fl. 8, 217), and to Rhodope (L. 7, 450; Fl. 1, 728). Both writers mention the Caspia claustra (L. 8, 222; Fl. 5, 122), and non euri cessasse minas (L. 5, 608) is akin to cessante euro (Fl. 3, 483).

The similar or identical portions in the two poems are apparently used for metrical reasons, and need only some illustrations. Vires . . . retentat (L. 4, 723) suggested irasque retentant (Fl. 3, 97), just as ad aequoreas . . . undas (L. 1, 401) did et aequoreos divos (Fl. 1, 139). Compare also artus | Alligat . . . torpor (L. 4, 290) and sopor alligat artus (Fl. 1, 48). Longer passages are sometimes identical, as gravido Cynthia cornu (L. 1, 218; Fl. 2, 56) and longi . . . praemia belli (L. 1, 341; Fl. 2, 114); and sometimes varied, as longis producere noctem | Adloquiis (L. 10, 173): adloquiis . . . educite noctem (Fl. 1, 251); cunctas super ardua turris | Eminent (L. 4, 431): planctus super eminent omnes (Fl. 1, 317); Chaos . . . confundere mundos (L. 6, 696): Chaos . . . consumere mundum (Fl. 1, 832); dum sanguis inerat, dum vis materna (L. 2, 338): dum vires utero maternaque sufficit aetas (Fl. 2, 325); spissis avellitur uncus harenis (L. 2, 694): legitur piger uncus harenis (Fl. 2, 428). Notice the statement of Lucan (3, 199):

Deseritur Strymon tepido committere Nilo
Bistonias consuetus aves et barbara Cone,

which is reversed in the simile of Flaccus (3, 359):

. . . qualiter Arctos
Ad patrias avibus medio iam vere revectis
Memphis et aprici statio silet annua Nili.

One line in Lucan (2, 716):

Cyaneas tellus emisit in aequora cautes,

suggested a line for Flaccus (1, 59; cf. 7, 41):

Contieuit certas Scythico concurrere ponto | Cyaneas,

while Statius wrote with an eye to both (*Th.* 11, 438):

Pontus Cyaneos vetuit concurrere montes,
and (*Silv.* 1, 2, 40) . . . si Cyaneos raperere per aestus.

2. Statius.

There are numerous indications of the utilization of the words of Lucan by Statius, though the object was adaptation rather than reproduction. It may be held that the latter applies more to the *Silvae*; the former to the *Thebaid*. We find in Lucan (7, 482) Pangaeaque saxa resultant, which is nearly repeated in *Silv.* 1, 2, 223 Pangaea resultant, and at a further remove, *Th.* 2, 714 iuga longa resultant. Similar to this is 2, 716, *supra*. Statius has one poem (*Silv.* 2, 7) *Genethliacon Lucani ad Pollam* in which one line (23): Romani colitur chori sacerdos, suggests that Lucan is another Horace; see Horace (*Odes* 4, 3, 23): Romanae fidicen lyrae. But more complimentary than original praise applied to Lucan is the use of a thought from Lucan himself (v. 90):

O saevae nimium gravesque Parcae!
O numquam data longa fata summis!

a variation of Lucan (1, 70):

Invida fatorum series summisque negatum
Stare diu.

Statius seems to have regarded Lucan as a master in fixing geographical appellations. Lucan (1, 600):

Et lotam parvo revocant Almone Cybeben

accounts for the same association (*Silv.* 5, 1, 223): . . . Italo gemitus Almone Cybebe | Ponit. Variation is shown (*Silv.* 1, 3, 33):

Bruttia Sicanium circumspicit ora Pelorum,

which, though differing in form, is based on Lucan's words (2, 438):

Extremi colles Siculo cessere Peloro.

The crowded lines of Lucan (3, 214):

Accedunt Syriae populi, desertus Orontes

Et felix, sic fama, Ninos, ventosa Damascos
 Gazaque et arbusto palmarum dives Idume
 Et Tyros instabilis pretiosaque murice Sidon,

may be compared with the passage (*Silv.* 3, 2, 136 ff.) containing

. . . dulce nemus florentis Idumes;
 Quo pretiosa Tyros rubeat, quo purpura fuco
 Sidoniis iterata cadis.

In the simile of 7, 144 *incudibus* and *aegida* have the same position as in the simile of *Silv.* 3, 1, 130 ff. Other illustrations are: *gelidas ad Phasidos undas* (2, 585): *gelidi non Phasidis ales* (*Silv.* 2, 4, 27); *praecipitis superaverat Anxuris arces* (3, 84): *arcesque superbae* | *Anxuris* (*Silv.* 1, 3, 86); *Adriaco tellus circumflua ponto* (4, 407; cf. 10, 476): *undoso circumflua coniuge Peuce* (*Silv.* 5, 2, 137), a transfer being made from the Adriatic to the Danube; *Et Pelusiaci tam mollis turba Canopi* (8, 543): *Tu Pelusiaci scelus Canopi* (*Silv.* 2, 7, 70), *Saxosa Carystos* (5, 232) is repeated in *Th.* 7, 370 but *undosa* is used *Silv.* 1, 5, 34.

A few salient examples of the adaptation of other terms will also be given. Lucan has *visceribus lassis* (2, 340) in speaking of Marcia, and this accounts for *visceribus totis* in a similar account (*Silv.* 5, 1, 47). *Solacia fati* . . . tulit (2, 91), and similarly *magna feram solacia mortis* (8, 314) suggested *magna* . . . *solatia leti* . . . *feres* (*Silv.* 2, 5, 24), while *flammigeros axes* (*Silv.* 4, 3, 136; cf. 1, 2, 119; 3, 1, 181) is an apparent variation from Lucan's *flammigeros* . . . *currus* (1, 48). *Vergentibus annis* | *In senium* (1, 129): *vergimur in senium* (*Silv.* 4, 4, 70), and also in *senium vergens* (*Th.* 1, 391); *Acherontis adusti* (3, 16): with reference to the same, *adusta* . . . *litora* (*Silv.* 2, 1, 187); *taxus opacat* (6, 645): *opacat* | *Arbor* (*Silv.* 2, 3, 1); *mercis mutator eoae* (8, 854): *plagae viridis regnator eoae* (*Silv.* 2, 4, 25); *calcabatur onyx* (10, 117): *calcabam* . . . *opes* (*Silv.* 1, 3, 53). *Tanta oblivio mentis* (10, 403) is akin to *pigra oblivio vitae* (*Silv.* 1, 4, 57); cf. *desidis otia vitae ib.* 3, 5, 85. Compare also the use of *ophites* (9, 714; *Silv.* 1, 5, 35). We shall take the occurrences of *lanugo* to close this section. Statius has it (*Th.* 7, 655) *crescunt lanugine malae*;

(*Th.* 9, 703) nondum mutatae rosea lanugine malae, but more noticeable is Lucan's (10, 135):

Vix ulla fuscante tamen lanugine malas,

two words of which are used by Statius in one passage (*Silv.* 3, 4, 65):

. . . ne prima genas lanugo nitentes
Carperet et pulchrae fuscaret gratia formae.

The material from Lucan utilized in the *Thebaid* ranges from a single word to statements of some length preserving the same meaning and enough of a similar structure to indicate its source. Of the first we give only *maiestate* (3, 430: *Th.* 1, 209), and *terrigenae* (4, 553: *Th.* 4, 441). Two words are frequently retained in the same position, and sometimes in the identical form, as *Iunonis iniquae* (1, 576: *Th.* 3, 184), *furialibus armis* (1, 200: *Th.* 11, 90), *manifesta fides* (1, 524: *Th.* 6, 638), *amisere notas* (2, 167: *Th.* 5, 549), *ingestis . . . telis* (6, 232: *Th.* 10, 860), *Eoo | Cardine* (5, 71: *Th.* 1, 158), *ora redundant* (9, 812: *Th.* 10, 320), *ignis edax* (9, 742: *Th.* 12, 430). Here also may belong *cervice recisa* (9, 214: *Th.* 10, 516), though *remissa* is also read in the latter passage. Occasionally there is a necessary variation in form, as in *eiectat saniem* (3, 658): *eiectans saniem* (*Th.* 9, 101); *infecta . . . herba* (7, 851): *infectas . . . herbas* (*Th.* 5, 590); *astriferis . . . axibus* (9, 5): *astriferos . . . axes* (*Th.* 8, 83). At times there is a change in the order of the words, e. g. *O numinis instar* (1, 199): *instar mihi numinis* (*Th.* 10, 361), *dies . . . | Exoritur* (1, 232): *Exoritur . . . dies* (*Th.* 5, 296); *tacitas . . . fraudes* (4, 465): *fraude . . . tacita* (*Th.* 10, 721).

In many a passage in Statius one word from Lucan is retained and the accompanying term is varied, but still bears a close resemblance in form or in pronunciation to the associated term in Lucan. Illustrations of such changes are *exanguis . . . senectus* (1, 343): *exsanguis . . . anni* (11, 323); *mentesque tepescunt* (4, 284): *ungues . . . tepescunt* (*Th.* 1, 611); *urbis amatae* (1, 508): *telluris amatae* (*Th.* 7, 156); *fallaci . . . sereno* (1, 530): *fallaci . . . limo* (*Th.* 9, 475); *convicia festa* (2, 369): *certamina festa* (*Th.* 6, 924); *rore madentis* (4, 316): *madentes . . . imbre* (*Th.* 5, 597); *iuventus . . . Taygeti* (5,

51): Taygetique phalanx (*Th.* 4, 227); aere non pigro (6, 107): niger . . . aer (*Th.* 4, 584); Meleagream . . . Calydona (6, 365): Meleagria . . . Calydon (*Th.* 4, 103); in Tartareo . . . antro (6, 712): Tartarei . . . barathri (*Th.* 1, 85); funereae . . . mensae (6, 557): funereas . . . dapes (*Th.* 4, 307); rapidus Ganges (8, 227): marcidus Ganges (*Th.* 12, 788); compare tumido me gurgite Ganges (2, 496): tumidum Gangem (*Th.* 4, 387); inlicitosque toros (10, 76): nec Venerem inlicitam (*Th.* 8, 96); igne superiecto (10, 215): imbre superiecto (*Th.* 3, 251).

Groups of three words are of frequent occurrence and show the same phases. The permeation of the method throughout the entire work of Statius is indicated by the following selected examples: Sed nocte sopora (2, 236): sub nocte sopora (*Th.* 1, 403); permixto libamina Baccho (4, 198): tepidi libamina sacri (*Th.* 1, 513); nulla tonitrua durant (7, 479): rauca tonitrua pulsan (*Th.* 2, 40); foeda situ macies (6, 516): aegra solo macies (*Th.* 4, 702); turbo rapax . . . vela (5, 595): turbo rapax . . . saxa (*Th.* 4, 820); fractisque modestior annis (8, 476): cunctante modestior ira (*Th.* 5, 680); perfida . . . inconstantia veris (5, 415): hiberno par inconstantia ponto (*Th.* 6, 306); mentimur regnare Iovem (7, 447): Bacchum haut mentimur alumnum (*Th.* 7, 667); longa . . . ieiunia belli (3, 282): longae . . . ieiunia poenae (*Th.* 8, 255); siccae sulcator harenae (4, 588); sulcator pallidus undae (*Th.* 8, 18), and pigri sulcator Averni (*Th.* 11, 588); remanet pallorque rigorque (6, 759): abiit horrorque vigorque (*Th.* 10, 641); Balearis verberare fundae (1, 229): fundae Balearis habenas (*Th.* 10, 857). The last is a noticeable group, as the use of this sling lay outside of the sphere of the actors in the *Thebaid*. Magnoque exaestuatur igne (5, 173): miseraque exaestuatur ira (*Th.* 11, 297); Vos, quae Nilo mutare soletis | Threicias hiemes . . . Istis aves (7, 832): frigora solvere Nilo (*Th.* 12, 518).

Longer groups are fairly common, and the material which was adapted was drawn from all parts of the *Pharsalia*.

Ferrea belligeri compescat limina Iani (1, 62)

furnished *ferrea* and *limina* for (*Th.* 8, 56):

Ferrea Cerebereae tacuerunt limina portae;

while of *Commodat* . . . *Invidiam Fortuna suam* (1, 83) only the verb appears in *commodat iras | cuncta cohors* (*Th.* 4, 75). *Machina* . . . *mundi* (1, 80) appears as *machina caeli* (*Th.* 8, 310), but the accompanying statement in the *Thebaid* has *mundi | Robur inoccidui*, a variation from Lucan (8, 175) *axis inocciduus*. The thought in the declaration of Lucan (1, 92):

*Nulla fides regni sociis, omnisque potestas
Inpatiens consortis erit,*

is reflected in *Th.* 1, 127 ff. with *regendi, inpatiens* and *sociis*. Compare the geographical information in Lucan (1, 101) . . . *et geminum gracilis mare separat Isthmos*, with *Th.* 1, 120 . . . *et geminis vix fluctibus obstitit Isthmos*. The words addressed to Caesar, *Livor edax tibi omnia negat*, is practically reversed in the final statement of Statius (*Th.* 12, 818). The belief expressed in *terris mutantem regna cometen* (1, 529) is repeated in *quae mutant sceptrum cometae* (*Th.* 1, 708). Other examples are *curis animum mordacibus angit* (2, 681): *magnanimum stimulis urgentibus angunt* (*Th.* 6, 827); *mediisque sedent convallibus arva* (3, 380): *mediae ponunt convallibus Ossae* (*Th.* 2, 83). . . . *Emicuit per mille foramina sanguis | impius* (*Th.* 12, 776) in brevity at least improves the words of Lucan (3, 638):

. . . *nec sicut volnere sanguis
Emicuit lentus: ruptis cadit undique venis.*

Vergil has (*Aen.* 3, 659):

Trunca manu pinus regit, et vestigia firmat,

from which Lucan (4, 41) drew *fixo firmat vestigia pilo*, and Statius may have followed either one (*Th.* 2, 11) *et medica firmat vestigia virga*. The first part of *si sanguine prisco | Robur inest animis* (5, 17) is reproduced in *de sanguine prisco | Nobilitas* (*Th.* 3, 600), but *nobilitas* takes the place of three words in Lucan. Compare (4, 814):

Haud alium tanta civem tulit indole Roma,

with (*Th.* 2, 631) *nil indole clarius illa | Nec pietate fuit. Iam vos ego nomine vero | Eliciam* (6, 732) is neatly turned in *post vos ego gurgite pleno | Eliciam* (*Th.* 4, 693). *Rarus vacuis*

habitor in arvis (*Th.* 4, 150), and inarata diu Pangaea (*Th.* 10, 512) are based on the words of Lucan (1, 25-26):

Rarus et antiquis habitator in urbibus errat
Horrida quod dumis multosque inarata per annos
Hesperia.

How far the *Pharsalia* may have furnished suggestions for the *Thebaid* can not be determined. The fact stated in nulli sua profuit aetas (2, 104 ff.) is repeated in entirely different words following furor omnibus idem (*Th.* 5, 148 ff.). The simile (1, 674) beginning

Nam qualis vertice Pindi
Edonis Ogygio decurrit plena Lyaeo,

is retouched and expanded (*Th.* 12, 785 ff.), the words *Ogygiae* and *decurrunt* alone indicating the origin. The forest described by Lucan (3, 440) has some of the same trees mentioned by Statius (*Th.* 6, 90-106), and *fluctibus aptior alnus* seem to have suggested *alnus amica fretis*. In some of these there is scant resemblance, yet as the touch, Statius (*Th.* 2, 731)

. . . et flavo tollens ubi vertice pontum
Turbidus obiectas Achelous Echinadas exit,

certainly came from Lucan (6, 363):

et tuus, Oeneu,
Paene gener crassis oblimat Echinadas undis,

it can be seen how nearly he succeeded in producing an apparently new creation out of the material of Lucan. It would be needless to try to determine how far he has really succeeded in doing this. One can rest with the presentation of enough material to show that Statius adapted the material of Lucan as skilfully and almost as frequently as he did that of Vergil.

3. *Martial.*

Martial, like Statius (*Silv.* 2, 7), praised Lucan in poems addressed to Polla (7, 21-23; 10, 64). The same attitude of the two writers is indicated by several equivalent strains: M. Haec est illa dies: S. Vestra est ista dies; M. Lucanum populis

. . . dedit: S. Lucanum potes inputare terris; M. Nero crudelis: S. Ingratus Nero; M. Aonidum turba, favete sacris: S. Favete linguis . . . favete, Musae; M. bella tonanti: S. bella detonabis; M. colas: S. colit; and perhaps M. Heliconis gloria nostri: S. Romani . . . chori sacerdos. Taking this material into consideration we should expect to find that Martial made use of Lucan, just as did Statius, but not to any great extent. The shifting panorama of Martial is so unlike the epic pageantry of Lucan that there is little requiring a like coloring. The frequency of some geographical terms in Lucan may account for them in Martial, as *Niliacus*, 10, 14, 6. The association of the tigress with Hyrcania (L. 1, 328: M. 8, 26, 2; *Spect.* 18, 2) may be a common conventionality. *Caledonios* . . . *Britannos* (L. 6, 68: M. 10, 44, 1) have the same position in the line, and *barbara Memphis* (L. 8, 542: M. 8, 36, 2) stand together though separated *Spect.* 1, 1. *Lauriferos* . . . *currus* (L. 5, 332) begin and end the line, as do *laurigeros* . . . *penates* (M. 8, 1, 1). The statement *non ulla fuit iusti reverentia* (L. 9, 192) is reversed in *tanta tibi est recti reverentia*, Caesar (M. 11, 5, 1), while *dedidicit iam pace ducem* (L. 1, 131) may have suggested the combination *dedidicit pacem* (M. 2, 75, 3). If the words were found in the same connection in Statius we could justly hold that *invidiosa* (L. 8, 394: *Spect.* 2, 3), *venerabile* (L. 8, 855: *Spect.* 2, 5), and *subitus* (L. 6, 598: *Spect.* 14, 4) were drawn from the lines of Lucan. But the usual for Statius is the unusual for Martial, and some of the above may mean only independent use of the same terms.

III. PROSE ADAPTATIONS.

The discussion of the influence of Lucan on prose writers may well start from the statement (*Dialogus de Oratoribus* 20, 18): *Exigitur enim iam ab oratore etiam poeticus decor, non Accii aut Pacuvii veterino inquinatus, sed ex Horatii et Vergilii et Lucani sacrario prolatus*. Had Lucan risen to such prominence as a writer within the few years that had followed his death? Or is the statement true for the later period of authorship, or is *et Lucani* a later addition to the texts. The use of three names violates the almost uniform practice of the writer in giving but two (cf. 23, 7 ff.), just as he did doubled synonyms.

Was the phraseology of the *Dialogus* influenced by that of the *Pharsalia*? Of this there is little evidence. The metaphorical expression in *arcem eloquentiae* (10, 20) is not unlike Lucan's *arcem iuris* (7, 593), while it is so used by Statius (*Silv.* 2, 2, 131) and Silius Italicus (13, 771), and is found as early as Livy (28, 42, 16): *ubi Hannibal sit, ibi caput atque arcem huius belli*. *Statio* in *cum statione peracta* | *Astra petes serus* (1, 45) has the same meaning as we think it should have in D. 17, 15 (see *A. J. P.* XVII, 55). *Finierat* (L. 10, 193: D. 17, 15) is used in the same way by Ovid, and, if the immediate influence of any writer may be assumed for the *Dialogus*, it may well be that of Quintilian. The same is true of *hirta toga* (L. 2, 386: D. 26, 5: Quint. 12, 10, 47). This may also be true of *excedere modum* (L. 2, 142: D. 41, 18). Lucan (1, 67) appropriates *expromere causas* from Ovid, and either writer may be the source for the *Dialogus* (24, 12). The collocation *nemora et luci* (9, 33; 12, 1; cf. Tac. *Germ.* 45, 23 *nemora lucosque*) is not exactly parallel to Lucan (1, 453) *nemora alta remotis* | *Incolitis lucis*, which seems to be an adaptation of Sen. *Oet.* 961: *memoris sacri* | *lucos tenetis*. *Nomen populare* (L. 7, 694: D. 36, 10), and (L. 6, 780):

Effera Romanos agitat discordia manes,

and *domestica discordia agitat* (D. 41, 5) are the same. One phrase in Lucan (6, 59)

*Aut aliquem mundi, quamvis natura negasset,
In melius mutare locum,*

has the same subject as *quibus natura sua oratorium ingenium denegavit* (D. 10, 10), and the same construction as Tac. *Ann.* 11, 20, 9 *quamvis bellum negavisset*; cf. (*ib.* 15, 42, 6) *quibus ingenium et audacia erat, etiam quae natura denegavisset*. With the exception of the last the examples are not very striking, and seem to indicate only the possibility of the utilization of the *Pharsalia* in the *Dialogus*.

Tacitus

There is very little in common between the vocabulary of Lucan and that of Tacitus, and a comparison of extended sections of the *Annals* and *Histories* with the *Pharsalia* does not

reveal any necessary connection. Vergil (*Aen.* 10, 745) has *olli dura quies oculos et ferreus urguet* | *Somnus*, which is adapted by Lucan (7, 26 f.):

*Crastina dira quies et imagine maesta diurna
Undique funestas acies feret, undique bellum.*

Tacitus (*Ann.* 1, 65, 5) has the words *dira quies*, but with an entirely different meaning, *ducemque terruit dira quies*. *Securus veniae* (L. 8, 784) or *s. belli* (*ib.* 5, 526) or *s. pugnae* (*ib.* 4, 534) may have suggested *potentiae securus* (*Ann.* 3, 28, 7), and other similar associations, *odii* (*Agr.* 43, 13), *dedecoris* (*H.* 3, 41, 12), and *casuum* (*H.* 1, 76, 11). *Spargatque per aequora bellum* (L. 2, 682) retains the construction of Vergil (*Aen.* 7, 551); cf. *armaque late* | *Spargit* (L. 6, 269). Tacitus uses *bellum* (*Agr.* 38, 12; *Ann.* 3, 21, 13). Silius Italicus has the same expression in 9, 277. In imitation of Horace (*Odes* 3, 13, 14) *Me dicente*, Lucan has *Me reticente* (6, 813) and Tacitus the same participle (*Ann.* 11, 27, 3). *Spectatrix sceleurum* (L. 3, 129) is akin to *spectator flagitii* (*H.* 1, 56, 1). The verb *disternat* (L. 1, 216; 9, 957; *Ann.* 11, 10, 8) is not of frequent occurrence, yet is occasionally found in Pliny the Elder. Reminiscences of Horace and of Vergil are part of the warp and woof of the style of Tacitus, but there are not such indications of the use of the *Pharsalia* as are to be found in the later epic poems.

IV. ELEMENTS OF APPEAL.

1. *Geographic.*

The time covered by the poem is brief, but the geographic panorama stretches from Massilia to Egypt. When we bear in mind that Pomponius Mela, one of the uncles of Lucan, was an authority on geography and that another, the philosopher Seneca, had written a work on Egypt, we are not surprised that he dealt freely in such details. The places from which came the cohorts of Caesar (1, 396-446), the corresponding section about the Appennines and the rivers of Italy (2, 396-437), the places from which were drawn the forces of Pompey (3, 169-295), and the description of Thessaly and its rivers (6, 333-394), interesting as they may have been to the actors, lack the

distinguishing features which Vergil gave to his places by the skillful use of adjectives. Similar to these are the account of Africa, and of the grove at Massilia. In itself Africa had nothing susceptible of poetic decoration, so Lucan used his skill in a portrayal of its serpents. Nearly two hundred lines are taken up in describing them, so that he must have been satisfied with their rhythmic glidings, as in (9, 631):

. . . illis e faucibus angues
Stridula fuderunt vibratis sibila linguis.

I wonder if, when Lucan recited the poem, his audience could hear the serpentine glidings in the hexameter, as in (9, 709):

Squamiferos ingens haemorrhoids explicat orbes;

or (*ib.* 723):

Ossaque dissolvens cum corpore tabificus seps,
Sibilaque effundens cunctas terrentia pestes;

or (*ib.* 828):

Quid prodest miseri basiliscus cuspide Murri
Transactus?

Far different is the grove (3, 399-452). It was consecrated by barbarian rites, and beasts and birds feared to enter, though dragons found a refuge there. But it was soon destroyed after Caesar with his ax struck a majestic tree, and said (*ib.* 436):

Iam ne quis vestrum dubitet subvertere silvam,
Credite me fecisse nefas.

2. Ethical.

The gods were dead, and the whole ethical background is different from that in Vergil. The word *fatum*, singular or plural, is used some 250 times, and *fortuna* 150. Yet they had fallen from their high estate as designations of determining influences for men. They were no longer the controllers, but the controlled of men. *Invidia factorum series* (1, 70) is the current of historical events. In the line (2, 65):

Oderuntque gravis vivacia fata senectae,

we have the natural burdens of old age, and (4, 769) *fatum miserabile belli* is similar. Judged by the principles of Cato, his words (2, 287):

Sed quo fata trahunt, virtus secura sequetur,

was an act of free will under natural conditions. There is mere conventionality in the words of Pompey (7, 705):

Crede deis, longo fatorum crede favori.

The color of *fortuna* is the same. The success of Caesar in cutting down the grove, calls out the comment (3, 448):

. . . Servat multos fortuna nocentes,
Et tantum miseris irasci numina possunt.

Notice also the words (7, 547): *fortunaque Caesaris haesit*. *Fors* and *casus* are indeterminable, as is stated in (2, 12):

Sive nihil positum est, sed fors incerta vagatur
Fertque refertque vices, et habet mortalia casus.

Lucan looked upon his subject as an exhibition of human activity and used conventional terms to indicate the causes which he could not trace.

3. Characters.

The greatest characters in the poem are Caesar and Pompey and Cato, though not *longo sed proximus intervallo*, and Lucan is at his best in the delineation of these. Caesar is made to claim that he was feared (5, 668 ff.) as if he were such a one as the typical tyrant portrayed by the Romans:

Mihi funere nullo
Est opus, O superi; lacerum retinete cadaver
Fluctibus in mediis, desint mihi busta rogosque
Dum metuar semper terraque expecter ab omni.

But he is better known from the dynamic simile (1, 151 ff.):

Qualiter expressum ventis per nubila fulmen
Aetheris impulsu sonitu mundique fragore
Emicuit rupitque diem populosque paventes
Terruit obliqua praestringens lumina flamma;

In sua templa furit, nullaue exire vetante
 Materia, magnamque cadens magnamque revertens
 Dat stragem late sparsosque recolligit ignes.

It matters little that *emicuit* was suggested by Vergil's line (*Aen.* 5, 319):

Emicat, et ventis et fulminis ocior alis.

Equally good yet entirely different is the picture of Pompey (1, 135):

Stat magni nominis umbra;
 Qualis frugifero quercus sublimis in agro
 Exuvias veteris populi sacrataque gestans
 Dona ducum nec iam validis radicibus haerens
 Pondere fixa suo est, nudosque per aera ramos
 Effundens trunco, non frondibus, efficit umbram;
 Et quamvis primo nutet casura sub euro,
 Tot circum silvae firmo se robore tollant,
 Sola tamen colitur.

The last act expressed by *nutet* is the last of the *ornus* in Vergil (*Aen.* 2, 629) just before its fall, but Lucan does not anticipate.

For Cato he has lines equally fitting (1, 125):

Nec quemquam iam ferre potest Caesarve priorem
 Pompeiusve parem. Quis iustius induit arma,
 Scire nefas; magno se iudice quisque tuetur:
 Victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni.

If there are traces of Vergilian picturing in the sketches of Caesar and Pompey, may there not be Horatian philosophy in this, *scire nefas* being an adaptation of *nec scire fas est omnia* (*Odes* 4, 4, 22). However the greatest praise of Cato is that he was the guiding-star of Brutus (2, 247): *Dux Bruto Cato solus erit*. But he is best known by the famous characterization beginning (2, 380):

. . . Hi mores, haec duri inmota Catonis
 Secta fuit, servare modum finesque tenere
 Naturamque sequi patriaeque inpendere vitam
 Nec sibi, sed toti genitum se credere mundo.

If three short sketches incomparably drawn were a test of sustained poetic power, a place might be claimed for Lucan among the greatest. But there are no other figures comparable to these, and there are many scenes into which the poet has not succeeded in breathing the breath of poetic life. *Transfuga vilis* suffices as an epithet for Labienus (5, 346), and besides there is given his unsuccessful plea for consulting the oracle (9, 550-563). Appius is introduced merely to justify a discussion of prophecy (5, 67-236). This parsimony in presenting lesser characters left the view of the greater unobscured, and this is well if we assume the correctness of the characterization by Caesar (1, 313):

Marcellusque loquax, et, nomina vana, Catones.

4. *Orationes.*

Portraying the deeds of men without religious impulses, and of a society plunged in luxury, Lucan sought to brighten his poem by the introduction of speeches, of poetical figures, and of an occasional excursus. The judgment of Quintilian (10, 1, 90) that Lucan is better suited for orators than for poets is supported by the fact that more than one-fourth of the *Pharsalia* is given up to speeches. Intended to direct or to persuade, they deal with a wide range of activities, and present varying motives to arouse to action. From a rhetorical standpoint they would repay a careful examination, but as poetical elements, *a paucis, omnes disce*. The words of Cato (2, 301) are true to life:

Non ante revellar,
Exanimem quam te complectar, Roma, tuumque
Nomen, libertas, et inanem persequar umbram,

and (9, 581):

Sortilegis egeant dubii semperque futuris
Casibus ancipites; me non oracula certum,
Sed mors certa facit: pavidio fortique cadendum est.
Hoc satis est dixisse Iovem.

The appeal of Pompey to his soldiers (2, 531-595) begins:

O scelerum ultores melioraque signa secuti,
O vere Romana manus, quibus arma senatus
Non privata dedit, votis deposcite pugnam,

and, especially in the latter part, well illustrates *magni nominis umbra*, as he pictures his own past:

Pars mundi mihi nulla vacat; sed tota tenetur
Terra meis, quocumque iacet sub sole, tropaeis.

His remarks on the field at Pharsalia are fashioned after the same pattern (7, 342-382). There is an imperative at the beginning, *totas effundite vires*, the laudation of self in the middle, *toto simul utimur orbe*, the appeal at the end:

ultima fata
Deprecor ac turpes extremi cardinis annos,
Ne discam servire senex.

Later he encourages Cornelia (8, 84): *vivit post proelia Magnus* | *Sed fortuna perit*, and, when he was pierced by the sword of Achilles, dying, he approves of himself (8, 622 ff.):

Sum tamen, O superi, felix, nullique potestas
Hoc auferre deo. Mutantur prospera vita:
Non fit morte miser.

There is a touch of Vergilian color about Caesar's address to his soldiers (1, 299-351). It begins and ends as if they were the chief factors:

'Bellorum, O socii, qui mille pericula Martis
Mecum' ait 'expertis decimo iam vincitis anno,'
.
. . . 'neque numina derunt;
Nam neque praeda meis neque regnum quaeritur armis:
Detrahimus dominos urbi servire paratae.'

Conditions are as if Hannibal were descending from the Alps, and the thirst of Pompey is like that of the fierce tigress. The purported speech at Pharsalia (7, 250-329) is a creation by Lucan. It studiously avoids saying what Caesar records that he said; see *Bell. Civ.* 3, 90. A few touches are noticeable.

Nil opus est votis, iam fatum accersite ferro,
.
Conspicio faciesque truces oculosque minaces:

Vicistis. Videor fluvios spectare cruoris
 Calcatosque simul reges sparsumque senatus
 Corpus et immensa populos in caede natantis.

Well for Caesar that he was a better general than was Lucan a creator of speeches, for the speech ends:

Sternite iam vallum fossasque inplete ruina,
 Exeat ut plenis acies non sparsa manipulis.
 Parcite ne castris: vallo tendetis in illo,
 Unde acies peritura venit.

The poet suiting the actions of the soldiers to his own words continues:

Capiunt praesagia belli
 Calcatisque ruunt castris, stant ordine nullo
 Arte ducis nulla permittuntque omnia fatis.

Perrin (*A. J. P. V*, 325) shows the improbability of any such disorganized movement, and makes it clear that the poet was drawing on his imagination. At this awful moment can aught postpone the fatal clash that shall decide the fate of the world? Yes. A discourse of 75 lines showing the effect of the battle on mankind.

5. *The Simile.*

The simile is a noticeable feature in the *Pharsalia*. Not satisfied with placing two objects side by side so that the image may be intensified, Lucan develops each feature until the object in the simile stands out as if it were a separate picture drawn for its own sake. This can be seen by looking at a few in different parts of his work. His thesis (1, 68 ff.) closes with the words *nec se Roma ferens*, but this is forgotten in the picture which follows:

Sic, cum conpage soluta
 Saecula tot mundi suprema coegerit hora,
 Anticum repetens iterum chaos, omnia mixtim
 Sidera sideribus concurrent, ignea pontum
 Astra petent tellus extendere littora nolet
 Excutietque fretum, fratri contraria Phoebe
 Ibit et, oblicum bigas agitare per orbem
 Indignata, diem poscet sibi, totaque discors
 Machina divolsi turbabit foedera mundi.

This is an example of his earlier work, but the type persisted, as is shown by 4, 549, where he wishes to illustrate *totum . . . bellorum fecere nefas*. To do this he draws the picture:

Sic semine Cadmi

Emicuit Dircaea cohors ceciditque suorum
 Volneribus dirum Thebanis fratribus omen;
 Phasidos et campis insomni dente creati
 Terrigenae missa magicis e cantibus ira
 Cognato tantos inplerunt sanguine sulcos,
 Ipsaque, inexpertis quod primum fecerat herbis,
 Expavit Medea nefas.

Vergil (*Aen.* 1, 430-436) and Milton (*P. L.* 1, 768-775) show men or angels working as do the bees. But compare with these the description by Lucan (9, 283 ff.):

Dixit et omnes

Haud aliter medio revocavit ab aequore puppes,
 Quam simul effetas linquunt examina ceras
 Atque oblita favi non miscent nexibus alas,
 Sed sibi quaeque volat nec iam degustat amarum
 Desidiosa thymum: Phrygii sonus increpat aeris,
 Attonitae posuere fugam studiumque laboris
 Floriferi repetunt et sparsi mellis amorem;
 Gaudet in Hyblaeo securus gramine pastor
 Divitias servasse casae: sic voce Catonis
 Inculcata viris iusti patientia Martis.

These three show the plan of development that was followed even in the case of well-known objects, as the oak (1, 135), the lion (1, 205), the wind (2, 454), the bull (2, 601), and the hunter (4, 437). This development, over-development if you will, has this defect that it obscures the main object and makes the object in the simile seem to be the most important.

6. *The Excursus.*

A noteworthy excursus is that describing the feast of Cleopatra (10, 107-333) in which occurs the recital of Acoreus. It was a scene

“. . . where the gorgeous East with richest hand
 Show'rs on her kings barbaric pearl and gold,”

and to its completeness only one touch is lacking—the dissolving of pearls in wine. Here also may be placed the entire account of the African campaign which had no bearing on the decision of the main question.

7. *Political.*

Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are political, rather than poetical elements, yet they can be made the basis of a perpetual appeal to men, and it will not be a fruitless task to show what other generations may find in Lucan's deliverances on these subjects. At times he suits his words to the characters whom he introduces, yet his own views are made fairly clear in the reflections scattered through the poem. Lucan inveighed against, and no doubt enjoyed, the luxury of his day. Yet it is to this that he refers the ethical conditions which made the Civil War possible. Notice his delineation of the age (1, 158 ff):

. . . suberant sed publica belli
Semina, quae populos semper mersere potentes.
Namque ut opes nimias mundo fortuna subacto
Intulit, et rebus mores cessere secundis,
Praedaeque et hostiles luxum suasere rapinae,
Non auro tectisve modus, mensasque priores
Aspernata fames . . . fecunda virorum
Paupertas fugitur, totoque accersitur orbe,
Quo gens quaeque perit.

The apostrophe (4, 373 ff.) is also worthy of note:

O prodiga rerum
Luxuries numquam parvo contenta paratis
Et quaesitorum terra pelagoque ciborum
Ambitiosa fames et lautae gloria mensae,
Discite, quam parvo liceat producere vitam,
Et quantum natura petat.

The sole consolation (10, 110) was that the luxury of Egypt had not yet been transferred to Rome, although it too enjoyed the things sought throughout the entire world (*ib.* 157). Yet in the cottage there is no booty to be found during civil wars (5, 526);

praedam civilibus armis
 Scit non esse casas. O vitae tuta facultas
 Pauperis angustique lares! O munera nondum
 Intellecta deum!

But more than any rhetorical expressions, the words *animas viles* (5, 683; 7, 730) show the low value that was set on the lives of common men.

Lucan pictures the political situation with the words (7, 433):

Libertas ultra Tigrim Rhenumque recessit.

The view assigned to Pompey is interesting (7, 695): *sed par, quod semper habemus, | Libertas et Caesar erit*. Lucan felt that Cato lived not after liberty, nor liberty after Cato, and that *licentia ferri* (1, 8) held sway. His is the statement (3, 118):

Usque adeo solus ferrum mortemque timere
 Auri nescit amor,

and also (4, 577):

Sed regna timentur
 Ob ferrum, et saevis libertas uritur armis.

He has put into the mouth of Pothinus, advocating the murder of Pompey, words not unusual for the declaimers against tyranny (8, 487):

Sidera terra
 Ut distant et flamma mari, sic utile recto.
 Sceptrorum vis tota perit, si pendere iusta
 Incipit, evertitque arces respectus honesti.
 Libertas scelerum est, quae regna invisa tuetur,
 Sublatusque modus gladiis. Facere omnia saeve
 Non inpune licet, nisi cum facis. Exeat aula,
 Qui volt esse pius. Virtus et summa potestas
 Non coeunt; semper metuet, quem saeva pudebunt.

Nil facimus non sponte dei, declares Cato (9, 574), after the questions:

An noceat vis ulla bono? Fortunaque perdat
 Opposita virtute minas, laudandaque velle
 Sit satis, et numquam successu crescat honestum?

The animus of the actors is indicated by *regnandi sola voluptas* (8, 294). It was a time when the human race *unoque sub ictu stat* (6, 613), and when the best injunction was *disce ferire | disce mori* (5, 363), the best hope for the present, *satis est iam posse mori* (2, 109), and, for the future, in *regnum nasci* (7, 643). It is only the lowly that is carefree (8, 242):

Quanto igitur mundi dominis securius aevum
Verus pauper agit!

See also the section beginning *felix qui potuit* (4, 393). Wretched are they who carry on war (4, 382). He repeats established Roman belief in *properante ruina | summa cadunt* (5, 746). *Quis scelerum modus?* he asks (1, 334), and his answer is *excessit medicina modum* (2, 142).

In developing interesting scenes and themes he made use of a noticeable verbal skill. He has *ignis edax* (9, 742), as well as *aetas edax* (7, 397); *pontus vorax* (2, 663), as well as engulfing interest, *usura vorax* (1, 181). Equally graphic is *vaesana quies* (7, 764). *Gloria . . . laetificat* (3, 48) is a bold putting, and as rare as is *limes . . . disternat* (1, 216) or *vestes discriminat auro* (2, 357).

V. CONCLUSION.

We find (*Bell. Hisp.* 31, 7): *Hic, ut ait Ennius, pes pede premitur, armis teruntur arma* showing that the pitting of part against part was not unpracticed in early Latin poetry. May we not assume that to the readers of Lucan as well as of other poets such collocations retained somewhat of the flavor of antiquity. Some illustrations are *pectore pectus | Urgueri* (4, 624; cf. 4, 783); *sonant . . . ensibus enses* (7, 573).

While he was under obligations to the masters of poetry, he too had brilliancies of his own. Tennyson sings:

" 'Tis well; 'tis something; we may stand
Where he in English earth is laid,
And from his ashes may be made
The violet of his native land."

Lucan has practically the same thought (7, 865):

Vellere surgentem de nostris ossibus herbam,

with a like coloring in (*ib.* 851):

Quae seges infecta surget non decolor herba?

The best in the *Pharsalia* are the pictures of Caesar, Pompey and Cato, and in spite of the skill shown in developing scenes and themes, the poem does not have permeating interest. Transactions in Spain, Africa and Egypt are too loosely connected with the great strife to be of absorbing interest. The *Pharsalia* can be compared with the *Festus* of the young barrister, Philip James Bailey—a poem which lives on in the lines:

We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths;
In feelings, not in figures on a dial.

We should count time by heart-throbs. He most lives
Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best.

Lauded almost without stint at its appearance, in half a century the *Festus*, as a whole, was dead. Both poems are brilliant; both lacking something behind the brilliancy. The climax of the *Pharsalia* is the battle-scene, but this is merely a game of chance, as is stated (*ib.* 445 ff.):

Sunt nobis nulla profecto

Numina; cum caeco rapiantur saecula casu,
Mentimur regnare Iovem.

A little further on he says that mortal affairs are cared for by no god. In the battle itself (*ib.* 487):

Rapit omnia casus,

Atque incerta facit, quos volt, fortuna nocentes.

At this point his reverence for Vergil overcomes a sense of propriety, and he has (*ib.* 512): inde faces et saxa volant, Vergil's words used to indicate mob conditions calmed by a man known for his merits. He declares that he will not tell what took place in the fight (*ib.* 556), yet he minutely paints the scene after the battle with the birds and beasts that feasted on the dead, and gives a summary in the words (*ib.* 809):

. . . tabesne cadavera solvat

An rogus, haud refert; placido natura receptat
Cuncta sinu finemque sui sibi corpora debent.

Hos, Caesar, populos si nunc non usserit ignis,
Uret cum terris, uret cum gurgite ponti;
Communis mundo superest rogos ossibus astra
Mixturus.

Cicero would be counted fortunate had he anticipated these lines; see *Tusc. Disp.* 1, 45, 108.

We may accept the judgment of Quintilian on Lucan, yet it was not the prose writers, but the poets who turned to him as they did to Vergil, and worked into their poetry many bars of his song, changed or unchanged, as if it were an assured fact that that which had won favor in the days of Nero would be welcomed in the days of Domitian. It was music, rather than subject matter which they had in view, although the interest in the latter was aided by many a verbal felicity, for Lucan touched nothing which he did not verbally adorn. Besides this element there was a noticeable fluency in his narrative, helped on by the use of the present participle. As an illustration we cite the description of Caesar (1, 149-157) in which are eight examples. However, with all its verbal felicity and fluency the *Pharsalia* does not attract as does the *Aeneid*, though every florilegium of Latin poetry should contain Lucan's pictures of Caesar, of Pompey, and of Cato.

R. B. STEELE.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

II.—THE DOCTRINE OF CAESURA, A PHILOLOGICAL GHOST.

In an article published in 1919, and entitled *The Theory of the Homeric Caesura according to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine*,¹ Bassett showed that the doctrine of Caesura was not developed until after the best period of ancient scholarship, that the ancient statements about it are confused and inconsistent, and that we can hope for very little assistance from them. Two years later, I supplemented Bassett's discussion by showing the inconsistency of current theories of caesura with the data of phonetic science.² It would be idle, however, to hope that two brief articles could lay so old and familiar a ghost. It seems necessary to use some more powerful exorcism.

Aside from the ancient grammarians and metricians the chief source of the modern doctrine of caesura consists of certain facts which have been observed in the ancient verses themselves, and particularly in the hexameter. Our first task, then, is to outline the facts about word ends in the hexameter which demand explanation or which scholars have attempted to explain by various theories of caesura.

In Homer the commonest position for a word end is at the close of the fourth foot and after the third trochee. Of the first 800 lines of the *Iliad* (omitting the repetitions early in the second book), 63 per cent have bucolic diaeresis³ and 60.6 per cent have feminine caesura³ in the third foot. The masculine caesura³ of the second foot occurs in 58.4 per cent of these lines. Most verses without the feminine caesura in the third foot have the masculine caesura in that foot, so that about 98.7 per cent of all Homer's lines have one or both caesurae of the third foot.

In compiling these statistics and all others in this paper I

¹ AJP. XL, pp. 343-372.

² AJP. XLII, pp. 289-308.

³ I shall occasionally use the familiar terms "masculine caesura," "feminine caesura," and "diaeresis" for the three possible positions of word ends in reference to the feet. I do not intend these terms to imply any theory about the reasons why the word ends fall as they do.

have counted word ends in elision, after prepositions and other proclitics, and before postpositive words except enclitics; I have not included the ends of verbal prefixes standing immediately before their verbs or the ends of words to which enclitics are appended. The statement of the proportion of Homeric verses with no caesura in the third foot is based upon Lehrs's⁴ list of such verses. He assumed a word end after a verbal prefix in *Il.* XXIII 159, because he felt it to be necessary to find a word end either in the third or in the fourth foot. Our practice requires that this verse be included among those without any caesura in the third foot. A more important difference between Lehrs's procedure and ours appears in the treatment of enclitics. Lehrs excluded from his list verses with an enclitic beginning after one or two syllables of the third foot, but we must include such lines as the following:

Il. I 106:

μάντι κακῶν, οὐ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπας

I 179:

οἴκαδ' ἰὼν σὺν νηυσὶ τε σῆς καὶ σοῖς ἐτάροισιν

III 205:

ἤδη γὰρ καὶ δευρό ποτ' ἤλυθε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς

III 220:

φαίης κε ζάκοτόν τέ τιν' ἔμμεναι ἄφρονά τ' αὐτως.

Lehrs found 329⁵ Homeric verses with no word end in the third foot. The additions required by not assuming a word end before an enclitic would probably increase this number to about 350, or approximately 1.3 per cent of the entire *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

It is customary to add that the omission of a caesura in the third foot is excused by the difficulty of getting a proper name into the verse. The fact is that proper names are no more difficult to handle than other words of equal length. As Lehrs⁶

⁴ *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis*² (1865), pp. 396-403.

⁵ W. Meyer, *Sitzungsberichte der Phil.-Hist. Cl. der Akad. der Wissenschaften zu München*, 1884, p. 999, erroneously reports that Lehrs found 219 such verses in the *Iliad* and 95 in the *Odyssey*. The latter figure is obtained by deducting certain repeated verses.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 416.

remarks, most of the lines in question might have been so constructed as to put a word end in the third foot, and, in any case, a number of the names which occupy the whole third foot are patronymics or the like and might have been omitted. After all, less than half of the lines in the list contain a proper name at the crucial point. It is foolish to suppose that a type of line that occurs some 350 times in Homer needs any excuse.

Nearly all of the Homeric verses with no word end in the third foot are subject to two remarkable limitations; they have no word end at the close of the third foot, and they have a word end immediately after the fourth ictus. In more familiar phrase, a verse with diaeresis after the third foot has caesura in that foot, and a verse without caesura in the third foot has masculine caesura in the fourth. The only exceptions are found in the neighborhood of verbal prefixes (*Il.* XXIII 159) or of enclitics (*Il.* I 179).

The last feature of Homeric verse that need be mentioned is that word ends are rare after the fourth trochee. G. Hermann⁷ found only 26 instances in all Homer. This small number, however, can be attained only by refusing to recognize word ends after prepositions or other proclitics or before postpositive words. If we make the count in our usual way, there are fourteen word ends after the fourth trochee in the first 800 lines of the *Iliad* (omitting the repetitions in the second book), or in 1.8 per cent of these lines. If we recognize word ends before enclitics—if we count as Lehrs did in collecting the lines without caesura in the third foot—4.5 per cent of the same lines have a word end after the fourth trochee. It appears, then, that a procedure which lessens the number of exceptions in the third foot increases the number here. Consequently some scholars have been tempted to count in one way in the third foot and in another in the fourth foot. We adopt the *via media* in both cases.

All of these salient features are retained in the later hexameter, in spite of some changes in detail. It is enough for our present purpose to record that word ends became more common after the third trochee and proportionately less common after the third and fourth ictus, while word ends after the fourth trochee became even more infrequent than in Homer.

⁷ *Orphica*, pp. 692-694.

In the Latin hexameter the feminine caesura of the third foot is very much less common than in Greek. It occurs in only 9.3 per cent of 300 lines of Catullus, 7.2 per cent of 300 lines of Lucretius, and in 11.1 per cent of 800 lines in Vergil. The masculine caesura of the third foot, on the other hand, is much more common than in Greek, so that in the first two books of the Aeneid 95.1 per cent. of the complete lines have a caesura in that foot. Even so, verses without caesura in the third foot are nearly four times as frequent as in Homer.

The Greek limitations upon such lines do not hold for Latin. The following have diaeresis after that foot without caesura within it: Ennius, *Ann.* 43, 230, 362, 522, *Scipio* 14 V.; Lucilius 394 M.; Lucretius III 258, VI 1067; Vergil *Aen.* II, 151, 555, XI 758, XII 144; Horace *Sat.* II 3. 134; Manilius I 194; Propertius II 17. 11; Silius V 497, VIII 327, XII 146, XV 13; Statius *Theb.* III 71; Juvenal X 358, XIV 108. There are nearly as many lines without caesura in the third or fourth foot; e. g., Ennius *Ann.* 43, 122, 230, 522; Lucilius 1074; Lucretius III 612, 630, 715, V 165, VI 197; Vergil *Aen.* XII 144; Horace *Sat.* II 3. 134, 181, *Ars* 87, 263,⁸ 377; Silius XIV 631; Statius *Theb.* III 71, 283. Scholars usually have no objection to admitting the existence of such lines in Ennius and Lucilius.⁹ There are various ways of getting rid of them if they occur in later poets. Sometimes a compound is cut into two words, either in the printed text or only in theory.¹⁰ By this means it is apparently possible to dispose of all lines in the classical and later poets which have no caesura in the third or fourth foot; but there remain a number of cases of diaeresis after the third foot for which the corresponding caesura cannot be provided by

⁸ It has been supposed (so most recently, Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, p. 9) that this line:

Non quivis videt immodulata poemata iudex,

was purposely constructed to illustrate "unrhythmical" poems. But, since Horace elsewhere composed lines without caesura in the third or fourth foot, in his own person, so to speak, he can scarcely have intended this line as a caricature.

⁹ See L. Müller, *De Re Metrica*², p. 218.

¹⁰ L. Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 460 ff.

the division of a compound word. Examples are Lucretius III 258:

Nunc ea quo pacto inter sese mixta quibusque

and Vergil *Aen.* XI 758:

Portat ovans. Ducis exemplum eventumque secuti.

To dispose of such cases Lachmann¹¹ held that in case of elision the elided syllable might be retained for the purpose of procuring a satisfactory caesura; his reading of Lucretius VI 1067 was:

Quae memorare queam inter singillariter apta,

and in this line he found a penthemimeral caesura! We need scarcely pause to notice such legerdemain; proof that elision involved complete loss of the syllable involved was adduced by Sturtevant and Kent, TAPA. XLVI, pp. 129-155.

In the use of word ends after the fourth trochee and at the close of the fourth foot Latin usage does not differ very markedly from Greek, although the tendency in Vergil and his successors is for the caesura after the fourth trochee to be a little more common and for the bucolic diaeresis to occur a little less frequently than in the Greek poets.

The striking feature in the arrangement of word ends in the Latin hexameter is that masculine caesura is rare in the fifth and sixth feet, fairly common in the first foot, and very common in the second, third, and fourth.¹² Many Latin hexameters have masculine caesura in all three of the middle group of feet, and a very large majority have masculine caesura in two of them. There are very few lines, like Vergil *Ecl.* V 52, with no masculine caesura in second, third, or fourth foot.

This is far from being a complete account of the position of word ends in the hexameter, or even of the facts which have been employed by students of caesura; but it will serve as a background for the present discussion.

The theories which have been built upon the double basis of ancient doctrine and the outstanding facts about the arrangement of word ends in verse are numerous and diverse. An account of them all would be not only tedious but bewildering

¹¹ In *Lucretii De Rerum Naturae Libros Commentarius*, pp. 413 f.

¹² Witte, *Rh. M.* LXIX, pp. 207, 214, 217, observed these features in Ennius. They are characteristic of all Latin hexameters.

rather than instructive. Bassett closes his résumé of the discussion in modern times with these words (p. 346): "Thus a century of research and criticism has left us still uncertain what value we are to give to caesura in the oral rendering of Homeric verse, for it has failed to make clear the nature of the pause which caesura is said to be." This is a moderate characterization. Not only do scholars disagree in their conception of caesura, but, as a rule, they feel no obligation to justify their disagreement. Nearly all subscribe to the dogma that caesura is of the utmost importance; but each writer is at liberty to construct his own definition and to operate with one caesura for each verse or with half a dozen.

Even more distressing is the vagueness or even inconsistency of many discussions of our topic. Bassett (*loc. cit.*) illustrates what he politely terms "the eclectic position" by an analysis of the treatment of caesura in White's *The Verse of Greek Comedy*. Even more striking eclecticism is displayed in Witte's important articles.¹³ He employs at least four fundamentally different conceptions of caesura, for which he ordinarily uses different terms, but all of which may be called "Cäsur". The suture where the two members of an original couplet are thought to have been fused together he calls by the traditional name "bukolische Diärese". A word end carefully placed at a certain point or at one of several points in the verse he calls "Einschnitt". For a word end placed at a certain point in the foot, namely after the first syllable of the dactyl or spondee, he coins the name "Arsisdiärese". A sense pause breaking the verse at certain preferred points is called "Rezitationspause", "Hauptrezitationspause", or "Hauptpause".

Virtually the same fundamental conceptions or some of them appear in various combinations in the writings of all scholars who treat of caesura, although few have come as near as Witte to recognizing their essential difference. It will be convenient to confine our discussion to the elements and to neglect the compounds in which they usually occur.

Probably the commonest ingredient in the current theories of caesura is the doctrine that the dactylic hexameter must, and

¹³ *Glotta* III, pp. 129-148, IV, pp. 1-21, Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie* VIII, 2241-2247, *Rh. M.* LXIX, pp. 205-232.

certain other verses may, consist of two or more rhythmic cola and that these cola must end with the end of a word, just as a verse must ordinarily do.¹⁴ The theory is sometimes based upon Aristoxenus' limitation of the length of a compound foot (*ποὺς μέγιστος*) in the following passage (fragmentum ap. Psell. 12, p. 85 Westphal):

αὐξεσθαι δὲ φαίνεται τὸ μὲν ἱαμβικὸν γένος μέχρι τοῦ ὀκτωκαιδεκάσημου μεγέθους ὥστε γίνεσθαι τὸν μέγιστον πόδα ἑξαπλάσιον τοῦ ἐλαχίστου, τὸ δὲ δακτυλικὸν μέχρι τοῦ ἑκκαιδεκάσημου, τὸ δὲ παιωνικὸν μέχρι τοῦ πεντεκαιεικοσασήμου.

The part of this passage that is thought to require a rhythmic caesura is the limitation of a dactylic *ποὺς μέγιστος* to sixteen primary times or four dactyls; for this seems to say that a hexameter contains more than one *ποὺς μέγιστος*. But one can find here evidence for a caesura only by making several unwarranted assumptions. (1) There is no hint either in this passage or elsewhere that the *ποὺς μέγιστος* must close with a word end any more than the *ποὺς ἐλάχιστος*, unless, to be sure, the *ποὺς μέγιστος* be identified with the verse. (2) Aristoxenus puts his statement as the result of observation; he says that these "seem" to be the upper limits of the several kinds of feet. We have no right to elevate a mere statement of fact into a fundamental principle of versification. (3) Probably the observations here recorded were made upon melic verse, since that is the sort of verse that Aristoxenus chiefly treated. The passage need have no validity for heroic verse—the type of hexameter in which scholars are prone to find rhythmic caesura.

Aristoxenus does not suggest a reason for limiting the length of the *ποὺς μέγιστος*, but one is supplied by modern scholars. Says White:¹⁵ "A colon is a rhythmical unit capable of continuous control by the voice, and therefore of limited extent." He does not explain why the voice is not "capable of continuous control" over as great an extent of dactylic rhythm as of iambic or paeonic. And yet, if such control can cover as much as twenty-five primary times, we have here no reason for a caesura

¹⁴ For an incomplete list of scholars who hold this view, see Bassett, pp. 345 ff.

¹⁵ *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, p. 7.

in the dactylic hexameter. We may note in passing that any scholar who assumes a caesura in the hexameter upon the strength of Aristoxenus's dictum is logically bound to reject the dogma of a rhythmic caesura in the iambic trimeter. It is for this reason that Klotz¹⁶ refuses to find any rhythmic significance in the caesura of the trimeter.

Other scholars¹⁷ say more explicitly that the hexameter was too long a verse to be recited conveniently without a pause. Now this is simply not true; every man frequently pronounces breath groups as long as the hexameter line.¹⁸ But even if the statement were true, it would not be a reason for assuming any pauses other than those required by the sense, but for finding enough sense pauses to serve. The need for limiting the breath groups to manageable proportions holds not merely for verse, but for all speech. This explanation has taken us again into the realm of "eclecticism"; it is inconsistent to say that the function of caesura is to separate rhythmic cola and also that caesura is due to the need for breath groups shorter than the hexameter verse.

But, even if there be no demonstrable need of dividing the hexameter into two cola, this may conceivably have been done. The dactylic pentameter is to all intents and purposes composed of two members, and it might properly be printed as a couplet if that were convenient. If the hexameter always had a word end at some fixed point, it would be in nearly the same case. Lehrs¹⁹ undertook, as a matter of fact, to confine the Homeric caesura always to the third foot, but not even he could keep it at a single point in that foot.

¹⁶ *Grundzüge der altrömischen Metrik*, p. 165.

¹⁷ So Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, p. 100.

¹⁸ How thoroughly a scholar can cut himself off from reality when he goes chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of caesura, is shown by W. Meyer's explanation (*Sitzungsberichte der Phil.-Hist. Cl. der Akad. der Wissenschaften zu München* 1884, p. 997) of the "secondary caesura" in the fourth foot as due to the difficulty of pronouncing three and a half feet in one breath.

¹⁹ *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis*², p. 409, *Opuscula*, pp. 433, 459, 463 f. He was followed by J. H. H. Schmidt, *Die Antike Compositionslehre*, p. 112, and by W. Meyer, *Sitzungsberichte der Phil.-Hist. Cl. der Akad. der Wissenschaften zu München* 1884, p. 999.

If we treat the hexameter in the same way as the pentameter we are forced to conceive of it as a couplet whose total length is constant, but whose component verses vary in length. If we always prefer to divide after the third trochee, and make our second and third choice respectively after the third ictus and after the fourth ictus, about 60.6 per cent of Homer's hexameters will consist of 11 morae + 13 morae, about 38.1 per cent of 10 morae + 14, and about 1.3 per cent of 14 morae + 10. In Latin these three types of hexameter would all have to be recognized, although in very different proportions. There would also be occasional couplets with 8 or 15 or 16 morae in the first member. A series of verses unequal in length is natural enough; but it would be remarkable to have such unequal verses constantly combined into couplets of precisely equal length. To state the same difficulty from another point of view, the dactylic hexameter is a verse of extraordinarily regular metrical structure, and this regularity is inconsistent with the assumption that the members of the hexameter are irregular in length and structure.

Another difficulty with the rhythmic theory of caesura is that it involves a forced and unnatural way of reading verse. We may take it for granted that an obligatory feature of versification must be in some way audible. It has usually been assumed that the slight pause which has been thought to occur at the end of every word, was enough to separate the two rhythmic cola. As we shall see below (p. 347), there were no pauses at word ends within a breath group; but, even if, for the sake of the argument, we concede such pauses, the placing of one of them in the third or fourth foot could not have led the hearer to infer a division of the verse there. In *Il.* I 13:

'Ατρειδῆς. ὁ γὰρ ἦλθε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν,

there are seven word ends, and the one after ἦλθε could not have been more noticeable than the others unless it was audibly distinguished from them in some way; if there was no departure from the natural pronunciation of these words, the pause after 'Ατρειδῆς must have been the only one to be distinguished from the rest.

Lehrs (*loc. cit.*) thought that caesura was marked by higher

pitch on the first syllable of the third foot succeeded by lowered pitch on the following short syllable in case of feminine caesura or on the latter part of the long syllable itself in case of masculine caesura. This theory is probably not held by any one today; but if it needs refutation, this is provided by the use of the Greek accents in the third foot of the hexameter. The modulation which Lehrs prescribes would amount to acute accent on the second syllable before the feminine caesura and circumflex on the syllable before the masculine caesura; the poets would certainly have provided such accents as far as possible, but no tendency in that direction can be observed.

Almost as unnatural as this would be the reading of every hexameter with an arbitrary pause in the third or fourth foot, regardless of the requirements of the sense. And yet there seems to be no other way in which the rhythmical cola could be distinguished in delivery. Sound method requires us to reject such a theory unless strong evidence can be adduced in its favor.

The rhythmic theory was, of course, suggested by the fact that over 98 per cent of the Greek hexameters have a word end in the third foot. This evidence is counterbalanced by the different state of affairs in Latin. The only other evidence that has been adduced is the occasional use of a short syllable for a long before the so-called main caesura, and the occasional occurrence of hiatus at the same point. Meister²⁰ has recently discussed the use of short final syllables for long in Homer. Since such lengthening occurs throughout the verse and in the arsis as well as in the thesis, he concludes that the practice must have had its origin, not in metrical considerations, but in the development of the epic dialect. In verses and verse tags that were handed down from poet to poet, the loss of one of a group of consonants (most frequently σ or ς) deprived certain syllables of their length by position. On the analogy of such traditional phrases, new ones were sometimes composed with a similar irregularity. Hiatus²¹ also occurs in various parts of the verse, and it is almost as frequent at the end of the first foot as after the third trochee. The similar licences in Latin verse are no doubt imitative of the Greek hexameter; here too the occurrences

²⁰ *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*, pp. 40-42.

²¹ See Meister, *op. cit.*, p. 252.

are so widely distributed through the line that they cannot be said to support the theory of rhythmical caesura.²²

That theory, then, involves serious difficulties and rests upon no evidence of importance. Meillet²³ is right in insisting that caesura does not mark the end of a rhythmical member.

The belief that the hexameter consists of two cola has suggested to various scholars that it is historically a fusion of two short verses. This theory has one advantage over the more strictly rhythmical theory; it explains the prevailing incidence of word ends at the end of the first member of the original couplet as due to tradition, and at the same time it provides a ready explanation of verses without a word end there—they would represent a newer type of line that developed after the fusion of the originally distinct members.

There have been two important suggestions of this sort. Theodor Bergk²⁴ derived the hexameter from an enoplios, $\bar{\cup}-\bar{\cup}-\bar{\cup}-\bar{\cup}-\bar{\cup}-\bar{\cup}$, and a paroemiac, $\bar{\cup}-\bar{\cup}-\bar{\cup}-\bar{\cup}-\bar{\cup}$, the point of fusion being after the third ictus. Usener²⁵ pointed out that the prevailing feminine caesura in Homer was against the assumption of the enoplios as the first element. He thought that the heroic verse consisted of two paroemiacs. Usener undertook to trace the paroemiac among several Indo-European peoples, and he believed that he had discovered numerous imperfectly fused hexameters in Homer, Hesiod, Sappho, and also a few in Greek inscriptions of classical times. It is now known, however, that his Germanic and Slavic material is of recent origin, while the interpretation of the Iranian and Indian verse which he followed, is no longer accepted by specialists in those languages. Few scholars would today be inclined to see in imperfect epigraphical hexameters of classical times anything but unsuccessful attempts of amateur versifiers to write ordinary heroic lines. As we have just seen, the irregularities of the Homeric hexameter scarcely point to a division of the verse in the third foot.

²² The material in Vergil is conveniently collected in Johnston, *The Metrical Licences of Vergil*, pp. 19-24, 38-41.

²³ *Les Origines Indo-Européennes des Mètres Grecs*, p. 10.

²⁴ *Ueber das älteste Versmass der Griechen; Programm der Universität Freiburg = Kleine Philologische Schriften* 2, pp. 392 ff.

²⁵ *Altgriechischer Versbau*.

There is, then, really nothing in favor of Bergk's and Usener's theory, except the presence of a word end in the third foot of nearly all Homeric lines. Even this evidence is weakened by the fact that lapse of time did not tend further to obscure the assumed suture in the verse; the Alexandrian hexameter is even closer than Homer's to Usener's original couplet.

Others have seen in the bucolic diaeresis the point of fusion between a dactylic tetrameter and an adonic, a suggestion which has been ingeniously supported by Witte in one of the articles referred to above.²⁶ His argument consists of a series of hypotheses by which he traces the development, from the assumed couplet, of several common types of Homeric line and explains a number of Homeric forms and words as having been created by the poets to assist in constructing the couplet and the successor types. Most of what he says is plausible, but there is no real evidence behind the theory except that about 63 per cent of Homer's verses have a word end at the end of the fourth foot and that this is the most common position for a sense pause within the line. Meister²⁷ is right in withholding assent to Witte's theory of the origin of the hexameter.

A third conception of caesura asserts that if word ends coincide with the ends of metrical units the verse tends to fall apart.²⁸ Hence arises a sharp distinction between a word end within a foot, called caesura, and a word end at the close of a foot, called diaeresis. I confess that it is difficult for me to take the theory seriously. It seems to imply that the reciter's attention is fixed upon grammar and meter rather than upon meaning and music, that he is thinking of words rather than of sentences and that he is picking out feet rather than feeling the swing of the verse. Such an attitude is to be found, no doubt, among schoolmasters and schoolboys; we call the result "scansion".

Now, for many centuries scansion has been taught in connection with the first book of the *Iliad*, and this, I suspect, is the reason why two ancient schoolmasters and one modern²⁹

²⁶ *Glotta*, IV, pp. 1-21.

²⁷ *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*, pp. 57, 231, 233.

²⁸ Rossbach-Westphal, *Metrik*³, pp. 27, 32; L. Müller, *De Re Metrica*², p. 198.

²⁹ See Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*², p. 184, and references.

have found fault with the only verse in that book in which there is a word end at the close of each foot, namely line 214:

ἄβριος εἵνεκα τῆσδε· σὺ δ' ἴσχειο, πείθεο δ' ἡμῖν.

Homer was probably not aware that the line was inferior to its neighbors; for he frequently composed similar verses. I have found 13 of them in four books of the *Iliad* and four of the *Odyssey*; ³⁰ if this proportion holds there must be about 78 in all. Furthermore there are many verses in which all the feet but one end with the end of a word. There are eight such verses in the first book of the *Iliad* and eight in the first book of the *Odyssey*.

Probably the only reason why Homer did not compose more verses of these two types is that only 11.2 per cent of his words are of the right length and quantitative character to occupy just one foot. Even with the help of monosyllables, pyrrhics, and trochees, verses with prevailing coincidence of word ends and foot ends would scarcely tend to occur more frequently than we actually find them.

No reader, as far as I know, has found fault with any Homeric verse with a word end at the close of every foot, except *Il.* I 214, and most critics find even that satisfactory. With *Il.* I 214 Christ (*loc. cit.*) couples Ennius *Scip.* 14 V.:

Sparsis hastis longis campus splendet et horret.

This is worse than the Homeric line, Christ finds, since it not only has a word end at the close of each foot, but it has no word end within the third foot. We hasten to admit that it is a bad line; but the trouble is not with the position of the word ends, as may be shown by altering it just enough to put all the word ends within the feet, thus:

Nunc sparsis hastis longis campus splendescit.

The line has not been improved; most readers will feel that it is somewhat worse than before. The chief blemish is the heaping up of harsh consonant clusters containing the sound *s* in various surroundings, and this fault we have made worse by our revision.

The theory under discussion must be tested not by an ex-

³⁰ *Il.* I 214, II 468, XIX 93, 255, XX 127, 193, *Od.* IV 153, 253, 508, 726 = 816, 821, 826. Another example is *Il.* IV 455.

amination of particular passages, but by statistics on the position of word ends in the verse. Table I gives the number of occurrences per one hundred lines of word ends coinciding with the ends of each of the first five feet. The figures are based upon 800 lines each of the *Iliad* and of Vergil's *Aeneid*, 500 lines of Theocritus, and 300 lines each of Apollonius, Catullus, and Lucretius.

TABLE I

Feet	I	II	III	IV	V
<i>Iliad</i>	44.1	22.1	21.5	63.0	24.8
Apollonius	44.3	19.0	15.7	64.3	26.3
Theocritus	54.6	16.4	38.6	77.8	37.6
Catullus	49.7	7.0	11.3	73.0	58.3
Lucretius	43.0	18.7	17.0	57.0	44.3
Vergil	42.8	16.4	15.0	51.1	60.6

Considerably more than half of the lines studied have a word end at the close of the fourth foot. Vergil and Catullus have a word end at the close of the fifth foot more than half of the time, and so has Theocritus at the close of the first foot. The feet which show fewest diaereses are the second and third, where we have an average of 16.6 per cent and 19.9 per cent respectively. If the poets had tried to avoid diaereses they could have done better than that.

In spite of the facts schoolmasters sometimes propose precise rules for the avoidance of word ends at the ends of the feet. Thus Monro³¹ says flatly: "The third foot must not end with a word". Table I shows that this amounts to grading Homer at 78 per cent on the first 800 lines of the *Iliad*!

Winbolt³² says that the Romans objected to word ends coinciding with the ends of the feet, but that "in course of time it was felt to be satisfactory if there was not in the line a majority of feet, the ends of which corresponded with the ends of words, the last foot of course not counting. Thus though a line in which there were two cases of the coincidence of the ends of words and feet might be held to be permissible, taste was against the threefold repetition of this arrangement." Now of the first 500 lines of the *Aeneid* 139 or 27.8 per cent have three or more

³¹ *Iliad*, Books I-XII⁵, p. lxxiv. Hardie, *Res Metrica*, p. 11, says that such lines "are not very common."

³² *Latin Hexameter Verse*, p. 71.

diaereses, and 16 or 3.2 per cent have four diaereses. To make matters worse, Vergil's supposed carelessness is greatest toward the close of the line, which was the most important part of the Latin hexameter. Of the first 100 lines of the *Aeneid* 47 have a word end at the close of both the fourth and the fifth foot. We cannot avoid the conclusion that Vergil paid no attention to this feature of scansion.

A cursory glance shows that the facts are equally unfavorable to the supposition that the iambic poets avoided word ends coinciding with the ends of the feet. Of the first 100 trimeters of *Iphigenia in Tauris* 54 have a word end at the close of the first foot, 21 at the close of the second, 38 at the close of the third, 51 at the close of the fourth, and 61 at the close of the fifth. Of the first 100 textually sound senarii in Plautus's *Menaechmi* (exclusive of the prologue) 54 have diaeresis after the first foot, 18 after the second, 39 after the third, 45 after the fourth, and 39 after the fifth.

We may safely conclude that the hexameter and the trimeter were never in danger of falling to pieces anywhere outside the classroom. In fact, no connected discourse can fall apart except at a sense pause, unless speaker or hearer is subjected to some physical or psychological disturbance.

More plausible is the theory that the poets tried to secure variety in the relation of word ends and feet.³³ The remarkable regularity of the hexameter was in danger of growing monotonous, and here, apparently, was one way in which variety might be secured. But this suggestion, like the preceding, seems inconsistent with the fact that Homer composed some seventy lines with a word end at the close of every foot. The later poets, both Greek and Latin, seem to have felt no difficulty in such lines; a brief search has brought to light nineteen of them,³⁴ and there must be several hundred others. Lines in which all feet except one close with a word end are common at all periods. I find 64 of them in Theocritus I-V and 12 in the first book of the *Aeneid*.

³³ Hermann, *Elementa Doctrinae Metricae*, p. 37; Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*², pp. 185 f.; Meister, *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*, pp. 55 f.

³⁴ Apollonius I 659; Callimachus *Apollo* 109, *Artemis* 236, *Delos* 214, 287; Theocritus II 21, IV 43; Ennius *Ann.* 522, *Scip.* 14 V.; Lucretius I 662, 809, 853, 1058; Vergil *Ecl.* VIII 83, *Georg.* III 213, *Horace Sat.* I 2. 123, 9. 5, 16, 51.

The principle of variety is violated quite as much by the occasional verses with a word end after each ictus syllable. I find four of these in two books of Lucretius (II 1156, III 96, 267, 885). Lines with five masculine caesurae are not very rare. Examples are: *Od.* II 397, IV 175, Theocritus XIV 21, Vergil *Ecl.* VI 9, *Georg.* II 103. There are nine such lines in the second book of Lucretius.

The strongest evidence that the poets did not try to secure variety in the position of word ends is to be found in passages of more than one line in which word ends repeatedly fall at the same point in the foot. Thus *Il.* I 214 (quoted above p. 341) with six word ends coinciding with the ends of feet is preceded by a line with four such coincidences. Equally striking is the opening of the *Odyssey* where lines 1, 3, and 4 have only one foot each that ends within a word. Although the second line has no coincidence of word end and foot end except at its close, sixteen out of the first twenty-four feet end with a word end. Theocritus II 21, in which all feet end with a word end, is followed by a line with the same coincidence in five feet, and that in turn by a line with four coincidences. Three successive lines, each with five feet ending at a word end, occur in Theocritus I 65 ff., and II 52 ff., and two such lines come together in Theocritus I 19 f., 115 f., 123 f., II 36 f., 42 f., IV 55 f., and V 24 f. In Vergil *Aen.* I 299-302 there are seventeen successive feet only two of which do not close with a word end.

The masculine and feminine caesurae are not commonly repeated so many times within a short space, but a good many such instances as the following could be found. In *Il.* I. 130 f. and again in *Il.* II 413 f. we have seven masculine caesurae in ten successive feet, and in *Il.* II 369 f. there are eleven masculine caesurae in fifteen feet. In *Il.* I 95 f. a word ends between two short syllables six times, and the first of the two lines ends with a trochee, so that we have virtually seven feminine caesurae in eight successive feet. Lucretius has twelve masculine caesurae in sixteen feet (II 1155 ff.) and sixteen in twenty-one feet (III 94-97), and he also has ten successive feet all with masculine caesura (III 885 f.). Vergil has seven masculine caesurae in nine successive feet (*Georg.* IV 251 f.).

Someone will reply that variety in this matter is nevertheless the rule with all the hexameter poets. Since there are three possible places for a word end in each dactyl and two in each spondee, and since more than forty different quantitative types of words are employed in hexameter verse,³⁵ variety in the position of the word ends would necessarily result if the poets paid no attention to the matter.

Under these circumstances one could make it probable that the poets tried to secure variety in the arrangement of word ends only by showing that they avoided the occasional repetition which chance would bring (and this, we have just seen, they did not do), or by demonstrating some sort of development of technique.

A development, or at least a difference, in technique has in fact been alleged. Havet³⁶ finds that the Roman poets had a more exacting taste than the Greeks in that they objected to having the same type of caesura in the third foot as in the sixth. Says Havet: "Le bon Homère finissait naïvement le premier hémistiche comme le second. . . Quand il ressuscita sous le nom de Q. Ennius, son oreille était devenue plus délicate, et il s'arrangea pour faire habilement alterner la cadence masculine et la cadence féminine." This, of course, is a jest; one learns from the context that in Havet's opinion the Roman poets had to pay closer attention to the word ends because every Latin word had, so he thought, a stress accent on the first syllable, which made the position of the word ends more noticeable. But most scholars believe that the early Latin initial stress had been lost before Ennius' time; and they, if they hold to the doctrine of intentional variety in arranging the word ends, must in sober earnest rate Ennius' taste higher than Homer's. Isn't this enough to condemn the theory?

Wilhelm Meyer³⁷ followed Havet in general, but differed from

³⁵ The common ones are the two types of monosyllable, six types of trisyllable (— — — and — — — are impossible in the hexameter), and nine types of quadrisyllable (— — — —, — — — —, — — — —, — — — —, — — — —, — — — —, and — — — — cannot occur). In five hundred lines of the *Iliad* I find fourteen of the longer types illustrated. Undoubtedly more than five additional types occur.

³⁶ *MSL*. VI, p. 14.

³⁷ *Sitzungsberichte der Phil.-Hist. Cl. der Akad. der Wissenschaften zu München* 1889 II, pp. 235-245.

him in thinking that both in Greek and in Latin the accent prescribed by the ancients upon one of the last three syllables of the word was a stress accent. Thus, while the relatively greater freedom of the Greek accent permitted great variety at the caesura and at the end of the verse, in Latin the end of the hexameter normally had just one possible accentuation, and the same accentuation was inevitable at a feminine caesura, as in:

Infandum, *regina*, iubes renovare *dolorem*.

There was no way, Meyer thought, of avoiding the monotonous accentuation at the close, but the use of the masculine caesura avoided its appearance twice in the same line. As a matter of fact, however, there were at least three possible ways of avoiding an accent under the sixth ictus. The most obvious of these is the use of a final monosyllable (*magnis⁶ dis, ridiculus⁶ mus*). Hypermetrical verses, such as:

Iactemur, doceas; ignari hominumque locorumque,

would serve the same purpose. Finally, words like *pharetra* and *volucres*, which were pretty certainly accented on the antepenult, may be used at the close of the hexameter. These three devices are all used sparingly. Final monosyllables were rare and hypermetric lines disfavored, and, if *volucres* and the like were favored at the verse close that is because bacchiac words were peculiarly convenient in that position, and the Latin language happened to possess relatively few of them.

For our present purpose, however, it is enough to note that Meyer's explanation of the prevalence of the masculine caesura in the third foot of the Latin hexameter has nothing to do with the word ends as such, but is based upon certain peculiarities of the Latin accent. He was here on the right track, although it was a favorite dogma of his that the Romans paid no attention to accent in composing verse.

A further difficulty with the two conceptions of caesura just discussed and with any theory which ascribes importance to the word ends as such is that they require that the word ends shall somehow be felt when verse is recited. Many scholars³⁸ assume

³⁸ E. g., Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*², p. 169; L. Müller, *De Re Metrica*², p. 198; Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 338; Lindsay, *The Captivi of Plautus*, p. 69; Hardie, *Res Metrica*, p. 27. Cf. Meillet, *Les Origines Indo-Européennes des Mètres Grecs*, p. 51.

that this is effected by a slight pause after each word. Trained observers of speech sounds are agreed, however, that there are no such pauses in the languages spoken today.³⁹ It is not likely that Greek and Latin differed in this respect from the modern languages, and, in the article referred to at the outset,⁴⁰ I brought evidence that they were in fact free from pauses within the phrase.

It has been suggested to me that the position of word ends is nevertheless known and felt and that this is reason enough for taking careful account of word ends in verse. It has long been the belief of most students of linguistic science⁴¹ that the naïve speaker has little or no consciousness of the word ends and that words are mere abstractions based upon more or less scholarly analysis of the real units of speech—namely sentences. This opinion will have to be modified in view of the considerations advanced by Sapir,⁴² who records "that the naïve Indian, quite unaccustomed to the concept of the written word, has nevertheless no serious difficulty in dictating a text to a linguistic student word by word; he tends, of course, to run his words together as in actual speech, but if he is called to a halt and is made to understand what is desired, he can readily isolate the words as such, repeating them as units. He regularly refuses, on the other hand, to isolate the radical or grammatical element on the ground that it 'makes no sense'." Sapir says furthermore that he has twice taught intelligent young Indians to write their own languages, and that they have spontaneously adopted the same system of word division that would have been chosen by any scholar.

Sapir has proved, I take it, that the naïve speaker has a fairly clear idea of what constitutes a word and that he can analyze his sentences correctly; but still we must agree with Bloomfield

³⁹ See Sweet, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1875-76, pp. 471 ff. = *Collected Papers*, pp. 3 ff.; Sievers, *Grundzüge der Phonetik*⁵, 231 f.; Passy, *Les Sons du Français*, pp. 43-47 = *The Sounds of the French Language*, pp. 25-28; Jespersen, *Lehrbuch der Phonetik*², p. 206.

⁴⁰ AJP. XLII, pp. 289-308.

⁴¹ See Sweet, *loc. cit.*; Brugmann, *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik*, pp. 281, 623 f., *Grundriss* II 1, pp. 1 f.; and especially L. Bloomfield, TAPA XLV, pp. 55-75.

⁴² *Language*, pp. 34 f.

when he says (*op. cit.* p. 66): "We find it obvious and easily proved that in most of our speaking we are conscious of the whole sentence only, not of the words into which it may be divided. The experiment is easily made: one asks a speaker to tell how many words he has used in the casual sentence just spoken. The answer, if it comes at all, will be surprisingly long in preparing." It is safe to say that, whatever may be true of reading a printed text, few persons are conscious of the word ends in speaking or hearing either prose or verse. At any rate such consciousness is not strong enough to be a controlling factor in the composition of verse.

Nevertheless many classical scholars are conscious of the position of word ends as they read Greek and Latin verse. This comes in part from much reading, but chiefly, I am convinced, from conscientious attention paid to the traditional rules for caesura. I draw the inference from my own experience. I have for many years read Greek and Latin verse aloud without a thought of caesura; but since I have been collecting statistics on word ends in verse in the hope of proving the folly of such studies, I have found my feeling for word ends improving. I fear I shall finally become as abnormal as any of my colleagues!

The fifth and last common conception of caesura is the sense pause. As far as I know, sense pause and caesura are never completely identified; scholars who correlate the two nevertheless find some sense pauses which are not caesurae and some caesurae where the break in the sense is of the slightest. In its pure form, this element of the doctrine of caesura would scarcely be recognized as a metrical, but rather as a rhetorical topic. Its most satisfactory ancient treatment was by a rhetorician, Dionysius of Halicarnassus.⁴³ An exhaustive discussion of it, uncontaminated by the doctrine of caesura, would be of great value for our appreciation of ancient poetry, and, indirectly, for our understanding of ancient verse. An excellent beginning has been made, as far as Homeric verse is concerned, by Meister,⁴⁴ although his attention is not directed definitely to this subject. Winbolt⁴⁵ has some excellent observations on sense pauses in the Latin hexameter.

⁴³ *De Comp. Verb.* XXVI.

⁴⁴ *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*, passim, especially, pp. 28-34.

⁴⁵ *Latin Hexameter Verse*, pp. 1-69.

At present we need merely indicate certain ways in which the doctrine of sense pauses in the hexameter will differ from all theories of caesura. The first and most important difference is that many lines have no sense pause. In this matter there is certain to be much difference of opinion, but unless we feel a need for separating a verb from its subject or from its object, the following lines from the opening of the *Iliad* contain no pause.

- 3: πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν.
 8: τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἕριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;
 11: οὐνεκα τὸν Χρῦσῃν ἠτίμασεν ἀρητῆρα
 Ἄτρεϊδης.
 22: ἐνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ἐπευφήμησαν Ἀχαιοί.

By the same criterion it can be shown that a good many lines have no sense pause at their close. A case in point is *Il.* I 11, quoted above. Frequently the sense pauses divide two successive lines into a number of shorter units, one of which lies partly at the close of one line and partly at the opening of the next, as in *Il.* I 74 f.:

ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ, κέλεαί με, Διὶ φίλε, μνησθῆσθαι
 μῆνιν Ἀπόλλωνος, ἐκατηβέλεταο ἄνακτος.

I do not now mean to assume that the lack of a sense pause at the close of a line necessarily obscured the stichometry for the hearer, although I am inclined to think that such was the case. The present point is merely that a study of sense pauses would have frequently to take account of more than a single line, and this would distinguish such a study from every form of the doctrine of caesura.

In the third place, the technique of Greek poets in regard to sense pauses was more precisely regulated than that of the Romans. In the Greek hexameter sense pauses were almost entirely excluded from the position after the fourth trochee, and they were extremely rare in the last two feet and at the close of the second and third feet. In the Latin hexameter sense pauses occur even after the fourth trochee. They are rare at several of the places where they are avoided in Greek, but they are fairly common at the end of the second foot and in the middle and at the end of the fifth foot. There is, furthermore, much difference

between the usage of the several Roman poets. This state of affairs contrasts with the familiar statement that the caesura of the Latin hexameter is more strictly regulated than that of the Greek hexameter.

Bassett showed that the ancient theories of caesura can safely be neglected by students of versification. I hope to have shown that the modern doctrine of caesura is no more secure. The fact remains that word ends and sense pauses are very unevenly distributed in ancient verses, and there are noteworthy differences according to period, genre, and language as well as individual differences. Both topics call for further study and explanation; but such work must not be based upon the theory of rhythmic cæla, or upon ill-founded theories of the origin of Greek verse forms, or upon the notion that word ends are either audible or psychologically prominent. Furthermore the position of word ends and the position of sense pauses must be treated as two separate topics, which are interdependent only because a sense pause requires a word end.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

III.—NOTES ON ARISTOTLE'S 'RHETORIC.'

The opening chapter of the *Rhetoric* answers the purpose of a modern preface. It proclaims at the outset the author's primary object in his book. Aristotle's object is to show how truth and justice may be aided by the effective use of public speech. In the body of the work fallacious arguments are, without comment, supplied to the reader as freely as legitimate ones. Owing to the seeming indifference with which he presents the one sort or the other, Aristotle has been accused of cynicism by modern critics who have, for the moment, forgotten such prefatory warnings as: "We must be able to employ persuasion, just as strict reasoning can be employed, on opposite sides of a question, not in order that we may in practice employ it in both ways (for we must not make people believe what is wrong), but in order that we may see clearly what the facts are, and that, if another man argues unfairly, we on our part may be able to confute him (1355^a 29-33)." Such is the ideal which redeems even the treacherous or arid ground along which the *Rhetoric* sometimes passes.

In a treatise on speech-making, Aristotle is naturally careful to begin well and to end well. The first words of his epilogue are business-like (ὁ δ' ἐπίλογος σύγκειται ἐκ τεττάρων), and the last are a true peroration (the epilogue of an epilogue),—the crisp, staccato, conclusion of which the final word of all is a demand for that act of *judgment* or *decision* on which so much stress has been laid in the author's treatment of parliamentary and forensic oratory: εἴρηκα, ἀκηκόατε, ἔχετε, κρίνατε. The words with which the *Rhetoric* starts are: ἡ ῥητορική ἐστὶν ἀντίστροφος τῇ διαλεκτικῇ. I hope to offer elsewhere some reasons for thinking that Aristotle in this opening sentence of his προοίμιον means to join issue—without losing a single moment—with Plato's contemptuous dismissal of rhetoric in the *Gorgias*. Rhetoric is to be regarded as the counterpart not of a choice *cuisine* (*Gorgias* 465 D), but of dialectic.

Nor does Aristotle delay to mention, critically again, his technical predecessors—the writers of "arts" of rhetoric (οἱ τὰς τέχνας τῶν λόγων συντιθέντες, 1354^a 12: cp. τεχνολογοῦσιν, 1354^b

17). The references, general or particular, to these writers in the *Rhetoric* should be gathered together; they are more numerous and instructive than is sometimes thought, though slight indeed when compared with what the lost *συναγωγή τεχνῶν* must have been. The term by which the dedicatory letters of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (1421^a 39) designates the class in question is οἱ τεχνογράφοι: the nearest approach to this noun in the *Rhetoric* is τοὺς νῦν τεχνολογούντας (1356^a 17).

In 1354^a 13, αἱ πίστεις (bearing the same technical sense as in the *Rhetoric to Alexander* and in Isocrates) reminds us that the *Rhetoric* is full of "terms of art"—a phrase which is doubly significant when applied to what was once thought of as the art of arts—and that a Glossary (with equivalents in English, Latin, and the modern continental languages) should be regarded as an essential part of any modern edition of the *Rhetoric*. πίστεις (which in the *Rhetoric* has both a broader and a narrower meaning) is at once a cardinal and a troublesome term. No satisfactory English single-word equivalent has yet been offered for it. Most translators are content with "proofs"; but this rendering entails a perilous confusion with ἀποδείξεις (not to speak of τεκμήρια, or συλλογισμοί). So perilous is the confusion that when Bishop Welldon has translated ἡ δὲ πίστις ἀπόδειξις τις (1355^a 4) by "proof is a species of demonstration," he not without reason comments that "it would be more natural to argue that demonstration is a species of proof than that proof is a species of demonstration." But Aristotle's meaning is that argumentative persuasion is a sort—an inferior sort—of demonstration: the enthymeme, in fact, is an inferior sort of syllogism, which he actually says a moment later in the same Greek way, τὸ δ' ἐνθύμημα συλλογισμός τις. The whole of the sentence will run in English, "Persuasion is clearly a sort of demonstration, since we are most fully persuaded (πιστεύομεν μάλιστα: ordinary belief passes into reasoned conviction) when we consider a thing to have been demonstrated (ἀποδεδείχθαι: cp. τῷ ἀποδεδείχθαι πείθονται, 1403^b 12)." As we may see from this passage and from a still more suggestive one in the *De Anima* (428^a 19 ff.), Aristotle is very much alive, notwithstanding the fact that the term had probably long been technical, to the connexion of πίστις with πείθειν and to the persuasive (rather than

demonstrative) character of all purely rhetorical methods of producing belief, these being mainly concerned with clues and probabilities and not with scientific certainties. So that we want, in English, some word in which this element of persuasion appears clearly. It is not easy to find, or it would have been found before now. Hobbes's sense of logic and his command of English lead to nothing more distinctive than "proofs" (even "arguments" would be better than this) in his *Briefe of the Art of Rhetorique*. I once thought of "persuasives," which I see that Professor W. D. Ross employs in his recent monograph on Aristotle. An objection to this is that it might be thought to cover pecuniary inducements; and poor as Aristotle's opinion of some of the rhetorical *πίστεις* is, he does not reckon bribes among them. "Suasions" had also occurred to me; but this may err on the other side—it may suggest too much of *moral* suasion. Badly as we need a single word when rendering a constantly recurring technical term, we must (I fear) make shift with "modes (or, sources) of persuasion," unless some briefer equivalent can be recovered or invented by our colleagues the English philologists. If "proofs" be retained, it should be qualified by the adjective "probable" or "rhetorical" (as contrasted with "positive" or "scientific"). "Evidences" would seem unsuitable, if only on the ground that *μάρτυρες* is one of the subdivisions of the *ἀτεχνοὶ πίστεις* (1375^a 24).—Like "persuasion" or "assurance" in English, *πίστις* appears—in Aristotle—to oscillate between passive and active senses: *πειθῶ*, which is frequent in Plato's *Gorgias*, is rare in Aristotle, though it is found in the passage of the *De Anima* referred to above.—It is worth notice that when the technical term *αἱ πίστεις* first occurs in the *Rhetoric* (1354^a 13), no definition is offered of it, any more than of *ἐνθύμημα* which is found in the following line and is simply said to be *σῶμα τῆς πίστεως* (the formal definition coming in 1356^b 4). Some knowledge of such terms could be taken for granted since not only had Aristotle himself already written books on the subject but, as he makes clear at the end of the *Sophistic Elenchi*, the whole field of rhetoric, in its more technical aspects, had been carefully tilled long before his day.

In 1355^a 1 the words *ὥσπερ πρότερον εἶπομεν* raise two inter-

esting questions: the Greek use of author's plural, and the value of the *Vetusta Translatio* as an authority for the text. The former question is too far-reaching for treatment in these notes. But it is well known that, when referring to his own writings in the past or future, Aristotle uses the plural number, and that the observance or contravention of this usage will often serve as a test of authenticity (e. g. in the case of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*). The πολλὸν χρόνον ἐπονούμεν which is Aristotle's quiet way of indicating his discovery of the syllogism (*Soph. El.*, ad f.) forms a striking contrast to (say) the δοκιμάζω γὰρ δὴ ἔγωγε with which a late Peripatetic (Demetrius, *de Elocutione*, § 15) asserts his claim to originality in a matter comparatively so trifling as the use of the periodic form in literary composition. Isocrates' use of plural and singular (in both verbs and pronouns) should also be examined, together with certain similarities, accidental or inherited, in the writings of Cicero. To Aristotle's use of the plural in the way above described there seem to be two exceptions only. One is in the *De Partibus Animalium* (647^a 5), where most manuscripts give ὥσπερ εἶπον πρότερον but one has the plural εἵπομεν. The other exception is in the *Rhetoric* (I. c. 1, 1355^a 2), where all the manuscripts (including A^c) have ὥσπερ πρότερον εἶπον. Here William of Moerbeke comes to the rescue; his *diximus* seems to show that εἵπομεν stood in the manuscript from which he was translating—a manuscript which may have been older than any other extant manuscript of the *Rhetoric* except A^c. Friar William (the good monk, the "bonus monachus" as Roemer rather patronisingly calls him) is still excellent company even when he nods drowsily as the rosy streaks spread, in the Homeric dawn of our recorded history, like human fingers across a brightening tract of land and sea. In the amusing passage (*Rhet.* 1405^b 18-20) in which Aristotle tells us that it makes all the difference whether you say, with Homer, "rosy-fingered morn" or (on your own account) "crimson-fingered morn" or (worse still) "red-fingered morn," William of Moerbeke unblushingly translates ῥοδοδάκτυλος ἥως by "rododactylus (apparently the Latin name for some primeval monster) quam ut (ἢ ὥς)"! Monastic sloth? No; Friar William was a meritorious scholar for his time; his very blunders are endearing, and

his literal simplicity is often a real help to us today in reconstructing the Greek text that lay before him.

The *Vetusta* must, obviously, be used with much caution; and sometimes it fails us altogether. We cannot, I think, draw any safe inference from the absence in it of any equivalent of $\tau\epsilon$ in $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$, 1355^a 21. In this passage, however, we may feel inclined to follow Dionysius (*First Letter to Ammaeus*, c. 6) in reading $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \gamma\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$, and in general Dionysius' quotations deserve careful examination. In constituting any new text of the *Rhetoric*, Roemer's Teubner edition would form a good, though not an absolutely trustworthy, starting-point. Roemer's remark about Cope's text is caustic: "talem textum post egregiam Spengelii operam lucem vidisse in patria Bentleii, iure mireris." The great fault of Cope, as compared with Spengel and Roemer, is that he neglects or repudiates (often, however, in Immanuel Bekker's company) many excellent readings found in the best manuscript, the famous Paris codex (Parisinus 1741, = A^c) which contains not only Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*, but the *De Elocutione* of Demetrius and the *De Compositione Verborum* of Dionysius, together with various other Greek rhetorical or literary treatises. P 1741 is not without serious blemishes of its own, such as those I have noted when editing the *De Elocutione* and the *De Compositione*; but for the *Rhetoric* it is of supreme importance, and all material deviations from it should be scrupulously reported. I may add, by the way, that but few passages which it presents to us should, in my opinion, be regarded as spurious. Part of the section (towards the end of the First Book) on evidence given under torture is clearly un-Aristotelian in language; and difficulties are presented by a longer passage towards the end of the Second Book. In the Third Book one wonders whether some of the rather elementary remarks on points of grammar are due to later interpolation or to the infancy of grammatical science in Aristotle's own day. So, too, with the observations on correct Greek ($\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\eta\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$), and the reference to the "Attic Orators" ($\omicron\iota\ \text{'}\text{A}\tau\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\iota\ \rho\acute{\eta}\tau\omicron\rho\epsilon\varsigma$): things which perhaps suggest an Alexandrian rather than an Attic viewpoint.

Reverting to Roemer and his strictures on Cope, I am bound to point out that his own text (in its revised and final edition,

published in 1898 during his lifetime) is deformed by many errors. The *corrigenda* I have marked in my working copy average at least one per page on each of his 235 pages: errors—slips or misprints—either in the text proper or in the critical footnotes. To all this must be added his ill-based dogmatism (whenever he says “ego scripsi” or “ego inserui,” the odds are you think the change is one for the worse), and his frequent desire to impose upon Aristotle too rigid a uniformity in word and thought. These criticisms imply no ignoble wish to decry German scholarship generally: the Berlin Aristotle is enough to save one from that. Any new recension of the text would be greatly indebted to the labours both of Spengel and of Roemer, but I hope it would not fail to enter in the critical footnotes most of Bywater’s suggestions and many of Herbert Richards’s, as indicating difficulties which British scholars have felt and tried to solve.

The end, as well as the beginning, of Aristotle’s Preface is effective. It serves to bring home to us what is still the crux of the whole matter. Aristotle failed to accomplish, for his pupils and for the general public of his and later ages, one all-important thing: he failed to invent a new term which should mark off the vicious from the good variety of rhetoric. It is near the end of his *προοίμιον* that he makes, with shrewd comments, the observation that there is no special Greek term to denote the sophistical rhetorician, whereas the sophistical dialectician has the name of “sophist.” ῥήτωρ, in fact has to do double duty—for a *trained speaker* and for a *tricky speaker*. The passage in question (1355^b 17-21) has sometimes been misunderstood. It may be translated as follows: “What makes a man a ‘sophist’ is not his faculty, but his moral purpose. In rhetoric, however, the term ‘rhetorician’ may describe either the speaker’s knowledge of the art or his moral purpose. In dialectic it is different: a man is a ‘sophist’ because he has a certain kind of moral purpose, a ‘dialectician’ in respect, not of his moral purpose, but of his faculty.” Herbert Richards (*Aristotelica*, p. 104) strangely says that there is no authority for “understanding ῥήτωρ in a bad sense, not *rhetorician* but *unscrupulous speaker*.” Apart from Plato, the fact that Aristotle sometimes (e. g. *Top.* 149^b 29) finds it convenient to

qualify ῥήτωρ by ἀγαθός, and Isocrates (e. g. *De Pace*, § 129) by πονηρός, seems to show that the word was at least ambiguous.

Jebb's translation of the above passage in the *Rhetoric* is: "For the essence of Sophistry is not in the faculty but in the moral purpose: only, in the case of Rhetoric, a man is to be called a rhetorician with respect to his faculty, without distinction of his moral purpose." Here "with respect to his faculty" is clearly a slip for "with respect to his knowledge (his scientific skill)," the Greek being κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην (not κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν). Some other slips and flaws in Jebb's rendering of the first chapter will be found at the following places: 1354^a 20, 24, 34; 1354^b 23; 1355^a 4, 23, 24; 1355^b 3, 4. The whole problem of translating Aristotle is difficult, or rather insoluble. Regarded as the first draft of a busy College Lecturer, Jebb's translation is a fine production; and many minor blemishes in it would have disappeared if he had revised it for publication. In the hands of so admirable a writer of English, Aristotle retains, in a high degree, his brevity, force, and point. Possibly the ordinary English reader, for whom a translation printed without the Greek text is mainly intended, would have been helped and attracted to a greater extent by a version which, with some sacrifice of terseness, was more self-explanatory and less abstruse. Such a version might, to many, have been more εὐανάγνωστος: especially if it used such modern helps to the eye (dashes, italics, careful punctuation, capital letters, numbered headings, and the like) as Aristotle would himself have welcomed with avidity. In the rendering of technical terms Jebb does not, I think, aim at any rigid consistency; there he seems to me to be right. On the whole, the English reader loses rather than gains by a pedantic uniformity in matters of this kind.

It is not till his Preface, with its many criticisms and general anticipatory remarks, is over that Aristotle, making (as he says) a fresh start, frames his definition of rhetoric: "Rhetoric may be defined as the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion (ἔστω δὲ ἡ ῥητορική δύναμις περὶ ἕκαστον τοῦ θεωρῆσαι τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον πιθανόν, 1355^b 25)." The definition contains no direct reference to *speech*,—to the "ars *dicendi*": the word ῥητορική makes this unnecessary. ῥητορική also implies τέχνη; and so not τέχνη but δύναμις ("the power of") follows. Rhetoric is both art and faculty. Like the

Preface, the word θεωρῆσαι must be borne in mind throughout the treatise: we must "observe," *but not necessarily employ*, all the possible means of producing belief. A little earlier (1355^b 10), Aristotle has said of rhetoric: οὐ τὸ πείσαι ἔργον αὐτῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἰδεῖν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πιθανὰ περὶ ἕκαστον. It is with rhetoric as with the art of money-making, of which an accepted view is said, in the *Politics* (1257^b 5), to be that its function is τὸ δύνασθαι θεωρῆσαι πόθεν ἔσται πλῆθος χρημάτων. It is sometimes held that the formula ἔστω δὴ in the *Rhetoric* serves to introduce a merely popular definition. In the present case, the mode of expression is no doubt easy and even casual, but the substance is of a scientific exactitude. On no other conditions can Aristotle the philosopher undertake to discuss the art of rhetoric.

In 1356^a 30, 31 (ἔστι γὰρ μῶριόν τι τῆς διαλεκτικῆς καὶ ὁμοία, καθάπερ καὶ ἀρχόμενοι εἵπομεν), we should, with A^c, read ὁμοία, as here given. Jebb, following Cope and the inferior manuscripts which all have ὁμοίωμα, translates "an image of Dialectic." But ὁμοία is confirmed by 1359^b 11, where the inferior manuscripts unite with A^c in giving ὁμοία δ' ἐστὶν (ἡ ῥητορική) . . . τῇ διαλεκτικῇ. As he proceeds, Aristotle has modified the arresting statement with which he opened his book, and here says, less strongly and picturesquely, that rhetoric is a "branch of dialectic and resembles it."—In 1356^b 4, 9, 20, further textual help can be had from Dionysius, and in 1357^a 20 from the *Vetusta*.—In 1356^b 30, Jebb gives, for δείκνυσθαι διὰ τοιούτων, "to be demonstrated by *persons* who are so." Must it not rather be "to be proved by means of *things* (*statements*) that are so"? Jebb's renderings of 1356^b 23-25, 36 ("for" looks like a misprint for "from"), 1357^a 28, and 1357^b 14, seem open to exception. In 1357^b 30-36, the connexion of thought would appear (as against Jebb's version) to be: "Dionysius, in asking as he does (= τὴν φυλακὴν, 'his bodyguard') for a bodyguard, is scheming to make himself a despot. For in the past Peisistratus kept asking for a bodyguard in order to carry out such a scheme (cp. διὰ τοῦτο, l. 35), and did make himself a despot as soon as he got it . . . all these being instances of the one general principle, that a man who asks for a bodyguard is scheming to make himself a despot." The Greek word-order would appear to indicate that the last clause means, literally,

"that it is the man who is scheming . . . who asks . . . <and nobody else>."—In 1360^a 13 Herbert Richards (*Aristotelica*, p. 104) says of καὶ τίνων τ' ἐξαγωγῆς δέονται καὶ τίνων εἰσαγωγῆς, ἵνα πρὸς τούτους καὶ συνθῆκαι καὶ συμβολαὶ γίνωνται, that "'standing in need' of the export of certain things, though a possible, is certainly a rather odd expression. Should not ἐξαγωγῆς καὶ εἰσαγωγῆς change places so as to soften it?" But δέονται means, as usual, "demand," "call for," and the modern economist would agree that, for a country's well-being, exportation of goods is imperatively necessary, no less than importation. On the other hand, Richards is right in accepting the loose use of τούτους. It means "the countries concerned," and shows how vague (in form) that prince of lecturers, Aristotle, can sometimes be. In their desire for clearness, some modern lecturers have been known to fight shy of pronouns altogether.

In 1357^a 13-17, the underlined qualifications in Aristotle's description of the enthymeme have often been overlooked: "The enthymeme and the example must, then, deal with what is *in the main* contingent, the example being an induction, and the enthymeme a syllogism, about such matters. The enthymeme must consist of few propositions, fewer *often* than those which make up the normal syllogism."

In 1358^a 23, the *Vetusta* may be right in the support it gives to the βέλτιον of the inferior manuscripts. Its Latin for the whole sentence is: "circa nullum enim subiectum sunt, haec autem quanto quis utique melius elegerit propositiones latebit faciens aliam scientiam a dialectica et rhetorica." Here we can hardly doubt what the Greek original was for each of these Latin words. Sometimes we cannot be so sure. Roemer (p. 5) thinks that "prava agere" implies ποιεῖν or πράττειν, whereas our Greek manuscripts give τὰ φαῦλα πείθειν; but may not the Latin translator be combining the senses of "do" and "plead"? Spengel (I, p. 171) says, with reference to 1354^b 32, ἀλλὰ πρὸ ἔργου ἐστὶν ἀναλαβεῖν τὸν ἀκροατήν, sed prae opere est per singula captare auditorem: "desunt Graecis verba per singula neque intelligo." May not the translator think that ἀνα- means "step by step"? In 1368^a 25 (ἡ ὑπεροχὴ δοκεῖ μηνύειν ἀρετήν), Spengel (I, p. 214) proposes to substitute "indicare" for "insinuare" in the Latin rendering "excellētia videtur insinuare virtutem," forgetting that, in writers of this period, "insinuare"

means "indicare." The sense which the translator attaches to ἀγαπητόν in 1365^b 16, 19, is not quite clear, but he hardly goes as far as "unique," which μετ' ἄλλων in l. 17 seems to exclude. It is curious that, in the ten passages in which πρεσβύτεροι (or the singular) is found, the translator—slavishly literal though he usually is—only once uses "seniores," everywhere else "senes." As the one exception (1395^a 3) is formed by elderly men who use wise saws and as, further, the Spartan γέροντες (1398^a 15) are Latinized as "seniores," we might conjecture that the distinction was one of worth and dignity—that only the "seniores et saniores" deserve the comparative. But this view seems to be contradicted by 1384^a 34, 1385^b 25, and 1413^b 1, in all of which cases men of consideration are concerned. It must be admitted, too, that Aristotle himself probably did not intend much difference between γέρονσι in 1390^b 4 and πρεσβύτεροι in 1390^b 6 and would have been content with the Latin he is given,—*senibus* and *senes*. The use, in classical and later Greek, of the degrees of comparison, and the special meanings of πρεσβύτερος, form a large subject on which one would like to probe into the mind of the priest who, born in Flanders during the thirteenth century, became Bishop of Corinth. Besides Spengel and Roemer, Dittmeyer's dissertation *Quae ratio inter Vetustam Aristotelis Rhetoricorum Translationem et Graecos Codices intercedat* (Munich, 1883) is sound and helpful. The Committee on Mediaeval Latin Studies, whose objects have lately been described clearly and persuasively by Professor G. R. Coffman, will not forget the attractive field opened up by Latin translations from the Greek. Outside that field, Giraldus Cambrensis is an important figure. As a Welshman, I should much like to know whether the "senior quidam" who, at the end of the *Descriptio Kambriae*, is alleged to have delivered that remarkable prophecy as to the survival of the Welsh language, was or was not simply "an elderly man"; and, still more, what was the language in which he addressed King Henry II.

The *Rhetoric*, in those larger aspects which make its minute philological study perennially worth while, is full of present-day interest. The United States financiers who have lately been taking an active and fruitful part in suggesting remedies for the troubles of unhappy Europe will, it is to be hoped, be the

better able to advise and warn their own country because of experience acquired abroad: "A comprehensive view of these questions (questions of national finance) cannot be gained solely from experience in home affairs; in order to advise on such matters a man must be keenly interested in the methods worked out in other lands (1359^b 30-32)." Jebb's "to be acquainted with the discoveries of others" hardly brings out the full force of *ιστορικὸν εἶναι* which implies the eager *curiosity* (of the best kind), and the spirit of *research*, that should always animate those who, whether as students or as men of affairs, have some glimpse of *ἡ περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα φιλοσοφία*.

Another important passage of which the concluding words have sometimes been misrendered is 1359^b 9-16. The translation should, I think, run as follows: "The truth is that rhetoric is a combination of the science of logic and of the ethical branch of politics; and it is partly like dialectic, partly like sophistical reasoning. But the more we try to make either dialectic or rhetoric not, what they really are, practical faculties, but sciences, the more we shall inadvertently be destroying their true nature; for we shall be passing into the region of sciences dealing with definite subjects rather than simply with words and forms of reasoning." The passage explains clearly the nature of dialectic and rhetoric, and the way in which they differ from particular sciences. The concluding Greek words are: *ἀλλὰ μὴ μόνον λόγων*. Welldon, following Cope, translates by "mere words." But some implication of rational discussion (*λόγος*, *ratio* as well as *oratio*) is surely present where dialectic is concerned; and, as a matter of fact, both dialectic and rhetoric have, a little way back, been described as *δυνάμεις τοῦ πορίσαι λόγους*, "faculties of providing arguments" (not "of providing words"). If Aristotle wished to say, in our sense, "they fight about words," his expression would, I think, be *μάχονται περὶ ὀνομάτων*. The phrase "mere words," inadequate in itself, is also calculated to prejudice the English reader who has a logical bent. It is the logical, and (if we may so say) the psychological, sides of rhetoric that Aristotle puts first (in Book I and Book II respectively): Book III, the *περὶ Λέξεως*, seems to be a kind of grudging afterthought and may have been separately issued.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

IV.—PTOLEMY'S SKANDIA.

The *Geography* of the 2d cy. Egyptian geographer Claudius Ptolemy contains, among other things, an account of the island Skandia.¹ Ptolemy describes the island as follows:² 'Απ' ἀνατολῶν δὲ τῆς Κιμβρικῆς Χερσονήσου τέσσαρες νῆσοι αἱ καλούμεναι Σκανδίαι, τρεῖς μὲν μικραὶ . . . μία δὲ μεγίστη καὶ ἀνατολικωτάτῃ κατὰ τὰς ἐκβολὰς τοῦ Οὐιστοῦλα ποταμοῦ . . . Καλεῖται δὲ ἰδίως καὶ αὕτῃ Σκανδιά, καὶ κατέχουσιν αὐτῆς τὰ μὲν δυτικὰ Χαιδεῖνοί, τὰ δ' ἀνατολικά Φανόνοι καὶ Φιραῖσοι, τὰ δὲ ἀρκτικά Φίννοι, τὰ δὲ μεσημβρινὰ Γοῦται καὶ Δανκίῶνες, τὰ δὲ μέσα Λενῶνοι. This description is obviously meager and obscure enough, yet it gives us more geographical information than anything else we possess up to the time of Jordanes. Ptolemy thus becomes our chief authority for the political subdivisions of the Scandinavian peninsula during the early centuries of our era.

Scientific study of the Ptolemaic geography is still in its beginnings. For a discussion of the problems and the methods adapted to their solution, see especially G. Schütte, *Ptolemy's Maps of Northern Europe*, Copenhagen, 1917. For Skandia proper, see also J. V. Svensson, in *Namn och Bygd* VII 1 ff. The matter of orthography in particular is troublesome. On this point Schütte, after a long examination of numerous Ptolemaic misspellings, concludes:³ "To a great extent, the present Ptolemaic orthography of exotic barbarian names must be regarded simply as a field of ruins. If therefore we examine each name separately, it would in many cases lead to nothing. Our chief key of identification must be a survey of the entire milieu. If we take a whole series of names instead of the single ones, there is a certain amount of hope that we may solve the riddles. A skilful Procrustes may distort single names into complete obscurity, but he will rarely be able to do the same with an entire complexus of them, if he does not at the same time disturb their natural order." Schütte's point is obviously well taken. In at least one case, however, he fails to follow his

¹ As everybody knows, the ancients thought Scandinavia an island.

² Ed. Karl Müller, Paris, 1883, vol. I, p. 276.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

own method, and inasmuch as the case in question concerns us nearly, I will take it up in some detail.

Tacitus, in cap. 44 of his *Germania* (98 A. D.),⁴ gives a comparatively long and accurate account of the Suiones or Swedes. He speaks of them as living *ipso in Oceano* 'in Ocean itself,' and adds, *subitos hostium incursus prohibet Oceanus* 'Ocean forbids sudden incursions of enemies.' From this we may infer that Tacitus thought of the tribe as living on an island, or on a group of islands, as the Ålands. Now in fact the Swedes lived in Scandinavia, which Ptolemy knows as the island Skandia. And yet Ptolemy's list of Skandian tribes does not include the Suiones. Naturally enough, Schütte, and others before him, on the basis of the historical facts, argued that the name *Suiones* must have stood in Ptolemy's original list. They therefore proceeded to restore it to the list by a process of emendation. Schütte remodeled the tribe-name Φανόναι: v. Grienberger and Bremer, the name Λενώνοι. Both emendations are obviously violent, and unlikely to gain general acceptance. At the same time, the argument that the Suiones ought to be in Ptolemy is a good argument, and the actual absence of the name would want explanation. What did Ptolemy do with the Suiones? As a matter of fact, he has them, I think, but he has put them not in Skandia but on the southeast shore of the Baltic. If we turn to the Ptolemaic description of European Sarmatia⁵ we read a list of tribes said to live on the right bank of the Vistula. Going upstream (i. e., south), we find, in order, the names Φίννοι, Σούλωνες, Φρουγουνδίωνες, Αδαρινοί, Ὀμβρωνες. Four of these names are easily recognizable: Finns, Burgundians, Varini and Ambrones. An easy emendation (*i* for *l*), already suggested, indeed, by Müller, gives us as the fifth tribe the Suiones. And this emendation is compelling, for we know that the Suiones dwelt between the (Scrid-) Finns, i. e., Lapps, and the Burgundians (of Bornholm), the former being to their north, the latter to their south. Furthermore, Schütte has proved that our list of names properly belongs, not along the right bank of the Vistula, but along the southern (and southeastern) shore of the Baltic. For the explanation of the Ptole-

⁴ Ed. Schweizer-Sidler (7th ed. Schwyzer), pp. 89 f.

⁵ Ed. cit., I 423 f.

maic displacement I must refer the reader to Schütte.⁶ We can now see also why the Swedes appear on the Continent instead of on the island of Skandia. In Ptolemy's day the Burgundians actually held lands on both sides the Baltic, in Pomerania as well as in Bornholm. And tribes known as Finns likewise lived east as well as north of the Baltic. When the Ptolemaic sources were consolidated, then, and when there took place that elimination of duplicates which any consolidation involves, the Swedes, who actually lived between Burgundians and Finns, were by an easy error located between the Burgundians and Finns of the southeastern Baltic coast, instead of in Skandia. Such a location would become imperative, indeed, if the Burgundians were to be confined to Pomerania, as actually happened. From all this it follows that the Swedes appear in Ptolemy, but that he locates them in European Sarmatia. Hence we must abandon, as wrong in principle, any attempt to read or emend them into Ptolemaic Skandia as well.—If the Ests and Livonians were offshoots of the Swedes, as some scholars believe,⁷ the Ptolemaic localization of the Swedes may even be looked upon as in a way correct.

My discussion of the Suiones has at least a negative bearing on our problem. We know that the Swedes do not belong in Ptolemy's Skandia. And with this knowledge we are able to approach with some confidence another question, viz., the question of Ptolemy's orientation. Did Ptolemy gain his knowledge of Skandia from the east or from the west? Tacitus clearly got his information from the east. Hence he knows the Swedes and the east Baltic generally. Ptolemy however seems to have based his map of Skandia on a western source (which we may call Sk), a source ignorant of the Swedes and all the east. And although Ptolemy doubtless had a map on which the Swedish name appeared, he did not associate this map with Skandia at all, but, as we have seen, incorporated it into his map of European Sarmatia. It is worth noting that the name *Scadinavia* (with its variant forms) reached the classical world through western sources, and that Tacitus, whose information about the North came to him from the east, knows nothing of the name,

⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 127 f.

⁷ See, e. g., Noreen, in *Fornvännen* XV 35 ff.

in contradistinction to Pliny, who got his information from the west.⁸

Let us now proceed to an examination of the tribe-names actually recorded for Skandia. Ptolemy's list may be divided into two groups. First, we have tribes living afar off: in the west, in the north, in the interior. These are the *Χαιδευοί*, the *Φίννοι*, the *Λευῶνοι*. Secondly, we have tribes near at hand, i. e., close to the Cimbric Chersonesus: east and south. Of the first group, the *Χαιδευοί* are usually identified with the *Heinir* of later days, who lived in the Norwegian district called *Heiðmörk*. Phonologically this identification is satisfactory. Geographically too it is passable. But one must suspect that the name *Heinir* in Ptolemy's days had a broader significance. Norway was that part of the Scandinavian world which was least affected by the civilization of the south. Its tribes therefore might well have been called 'the barbarians' by their more cultured kinsmen in the Jutland peninsula, and *Heinir* of course originally meant 'barbarians' rather than 'men of the heath.' The interpretation here suggested fits in better with the western location indicated by Ptolemy, and relieves us of having to assume knowledge (at so early a date) of a tribe rather distant from the coast. I present it for what it is worth.

Noreen has very plausibly located the *Λευῶνοι* east of Lake Vättern in the interior of Sweden. I can add nothing to his exposition, and shall content myself with a reference to his paper on the subject.⁹ From his identification of the *Φίννοι*, however, I must dissent. To make Scridfinns or Lapps of them is to put them much too far north, beyond the ken of the author of source Sk, or at any rate beyond his range of positive information. I prefer to identify them rather with the *Finni* of Jordanes, who seem to have held Värmland and westward. This region, though some distance from the coast, was accessible from the sea by way of the Gautelfr and Lake Vänern.

We now come to the tribes which Ptolemy has put in the east and south. And here the first question to be considered is that of the meaning of these geographical terms. That tribal locali-

⁸ See J. V. Svensson, in *Namn och Bygd* V 153 ff., and IX 68 bottom, 89 top.

⁹ See *Fornvännern* XV 37 f.

zations in terms of the points of the compass cannot always be taken literally is of course well known. So far as I know, however, the principles that actually governed the use of such terms have never been worked out. This is not the place to attempt the task of examining the material at our disposition here. I will content myself with a single example. The Norwegian retainer Ohthere, in his well-known description of Norway (which his lord, king Alfred, preserved to us), said that Norway was very long and very narrow. "And þæt byne land is easteward bradost, and symle swa norðor swa smæltre. Easteward hit mæg bion syxtig mila brad, oþþe hwene bradre; and middeward þritig oððe bradre; and norðeward he cwæð, þær hit smalost wære, þæt hit mihte beon þreora mila brad to þæm more." Here *easteward* obviously means 'southward,' and this although Norway in fact projects further to the *west* the further south one goes. Plenty of other cases of apparent misuse of the terms of direction might be cited but for lack of space. E. Hjærne has recently suggested¹⁰ that these seeming mistakes all have their source and root in Ptolemy and his successors. But I, for one, find it hard to believe that Ohthere made learned mistakes of any kind, or that the Icelandic sagamen were influenced to any great extent by Greek and Latin geographers in their application to their homeland of the homely terms north, south, east and west! In my judgment Hjærne would have come nearer the truth if he had turned his theory round, and suggested that Ptolemy and his successors got their false notions about Northern geography through a natural misunderstanding of the terms of direction used by their (ultimately) native sources of information.

Ptolemy's chief error (apart from his notion that Skandia was an island) came, I think, from such a misunderstanding. Scandia in fact runs from north to south, but he thought it to run from west to east. How did he get the idea? Here, as in the case of the name *Skandia*, the evidence points to a western source. Ohthere's use of *east* where one would expect *south* is intelligible only as a western usage. When a Northman made the voyage into the *austmarr* or even *towards* eastern waters, he would naturally look upon the various halting-places or land-

¹⁰ In *Namn och Bygd* V 73.

marks as milestones (so to speak) on his road. Each milestone would in this sense be *east* of the one before, whatever its true direction relative to the starting point. The same would apply to the Western trader, and accordingly one would expect to find, and one does find, the Cimbric Chersonesus bent to the east in Ptolemy's map. The usage under discussion is obviously logical and correct, from the point of view of the voyage as a whole, which was away into the east and back from the east. As obviously, however, it might, and did, lead the geographers astray.—Another error to which this usage gave rise was an eastward displacement of both the Cimbric Chersonesus and Skandia, the latter being thus forced into a position over against the mouth of the Vistula. This connexion with the Vistula (really fortuitous) is the true inspiration for all the theories which derive Ptolemy's source Sk from the east.

When now a Western trade ship rounded the point of Jutland and ventured further east, what part of the Scandinavian coast would she first come to? Pretty clearly (as any map will tell you) to the *häräd* now called *Fjäre*, where lived the *Feruir* of Jordanes. I therefore identify the *Φιραιῖροι* of Ptolemy with the *Feruir*. The variant readings in Müller are: *Φείραιροι*, *Φιρέσαι*, *Φιρεῦσαι*, *Φιράσαι*. These readings show uncertainty in the middle syllable: the reading *Φιρεῦσαι* comes closest to the Jordanean form. The Ptolemaic *s* reappears as the final *r* in Jordanes, if my identification holds; in Ptolemy's day rhotacism had not yet set in. The Greek ending is probably not original. Phonologically, then, the identification is reasonably plausible. Geographically it is well fortified, since the *Feruir* lay on the eastern trade route and consequently would be recorded in Sk as an eastern tribe. If Sk had been an eastern rather than a western document, however, the *Feruir* would hardly have appeared at all, and certainly would not have been called an eastern tribe!—Schütte, following Zeuss, emends *Φιραιῖροι* to *Φιναιῖροι*.¹¹ The emendation obviously does not grow out of the Ptolemaic text, and must be looked upon as violent.

What gave the *Feruir* their importance, and caused their name to be noted on the trade route map Sk? The chances are that the traders had a *dépôt* amongst them. The fact that they

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

were the *first* tribe reached also had its importance, doubtless, when the map came to be drawn. But a trade route map must have at least two names, and if it has only two the second name must be that of the *last* tribe reached, at the journey's end. The voyage under consideration proceeded, one may suspect, much like that of Ohthere, and Ohthere on his eastern voyage, as we know, skirted what is now the west coast of Sweden until he came to Selund. He did not go into the Sound, however, but crossed over, skirted the west coast of Selund, entered the Great Belt, skirted Fyn and finally arrived at the port now called Slesvig. Our antique voyagers seem to have followed the same course. Their voyage ended with the Φανόuai, however, whom I identify with the inhabitants of Fyn, the ancient Fionia, the Fjón of the Icelanders. If this identification holds, the Ptolemaic form has suffered a slight corruption: it should read Φενόuai.

But the eastern route was not the only one open to the Western trader. He might also venture upon a northern voyage. In so doing he could use as a base of supplies his *dépôt* among the Feruir, and by utilizing the streams and lakes he would be able to penetrate far into the interior. The northern route seems to have led up the Gautelfr and across Lake Vänern. To be compared is the expedition led by king Haraldr Harðráði, from Snorri's account of which I take the following passage:¹²

En er á leið sumarit, helt Haraldr konungr suðr til Konungahellu; síðan tók hann léttiskip öll, þau er hann fekk, ok helt upp eptir Elfinni; lét hann draga af við forsa ok flutti skipin upp í vatnit Væni. Síðan róri hann austr yfir vatnit, þar sem hann spurði til Hákonar jarls.

At the northern end of this route lived the Finni of Jordanes, and to the west of these the Heinir of Heiðmörk. If one penetrated still deeper into the interior, one came to the Ljunar, beyond Lake Vättern, whom Noreen (and Lindroth) have identified with Ptolemy's Λευώνui. At the southern end of the route lived the Gautar, who held the valley of the Gautelfr (their very name, indeed, was derived from that of the stream). Ptolemy's Γούται are usually, and with justice, identified with the Gautar. We are under no necessity, however, of emending the

¹² *Heimskringla, Haraldssaga Harðráða* cap. 72.

Ptolemaic form, as the commentators regularly do (if they accept the identification). The Gautar were a branch of the Goths, as we know from Jordanes, and it is to be presumed that Ptolemy knew the tribe by their generic rather than by their specific name.

The *Δαυκίωες* remain. They were clearly neighbors of the Gautar, and perhaps lived in south Bohuslän. Of their exact location however we cannot be sure, since neither name nor folk has survived. R. W. Chambers, in his edition of the English poem *Widsith*, points out¹³ that there might well be a connexion between Ptolemy's *Δαυκίωες* and the *Deanas* referred to¹⁴ in l. 63 of the English poem. Chambers says, "As the context makes it probable that they [the Deanas] are a Scandinavian people, it is tempting to suppose that, by a mistake of an Old English or a Greek copyist, they are the same people as are mentioned by Ptolemy as *Δαυκίωες*, and located by him in the south of Sweden, but whom it has been impossible to trace in any other document." Chambers is undoubtedly correct in supposing that the two names refer to the same tribe. He is wrong, however, in postulating any scribal errors, unless it be the use of the ending *-ίωες* for *-ωες*. The *k* of *Daukiones* probably stands for a Germanic *h*, like the *c* of *Cimbri*, *Chauci*. The extant English form can perfectly well go back to an earlier **Deahnum*. The forms in Ptolemy and in the *Widsith* thus correspond with great precision. The tribal name doubtless was built up on the base *dauh/daug*, familiar to us in the verb *dugan* 'be of worth.'—The *Δαυκίωες* are frequently identified with the Danes, but this identification can be made only by assuming that the Ptolemaic name-form is corrupt, and in view of its exact correspondence to the name-form in the *Widsith* the Ptolemaic form must be accepted as it stands.

The form *Δαυκίωες* casts further light on the provenience of Ptolemy's source Sk. The use of *k* or *c* (instead of *h* or *ch*) to represent the Germanic *h* is characteristic of the Celts.¹⁵ To put it in phonetic terms, the ancient Celt, like the modern Englishman, substituted his voiceless velar stop for the voiceless

¹³ P. 210 note.

¹⁴ In the dat. pl., *Deanum*.

¹⁵ See Noreen, in *Fornvännen* XV 23.

velar spirant of his Germanic neighbors. The tribal name *Δανκίωες*, then, owes its form to Celtic transmission. But this stamps source Sk as western, and confirms the other evidence pointing in the same direction.—In this connexion ought to be mentioned the Ptolemaic location of the three small Skandias. These are placed between the Jutland peninsula and Skandia proper. The location is correct enough, if the islands in question are Fyn, Laaland and Sjælland, the three chief islands of the Danish archipelago. Ptolemy however evidently knows nothing of Bornholm, Öland and Gotland, further east, and his general description of the Skandias thus indicates that his source of information was of western origin.

KEMP MALONE.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

V.—A SUPPOSED HISTORICAL DISCREPANCY IN THE PLATONIC EPISTLES.

In the eighth Platonic Epistle, 355e, it is proposed to make a son of Dion king at Syracuse. Yet Dion's only son had died before his father, some time before the eighth Epistle was written. Here then is a discrepancy that casts doubt on the genuineness of the eighth Epistle. It furthermore happens to be the only point on which there is difficulty in reconciling the statements of the Epistles with the account of events given by Plutarch and Diodorus. My purpose in the present article is to propose a solution of the difficulty that will, I believe, be an added argument for the genuineness of the seventh and eighth Epistles, since it indicates certain features in them that are in striking harmony with the view that they were composed by Plato to deal in each case with a particular situation.

The historical facts are as follows. Dion's only son committed suicide shortly before his father's assassination by Callippus.¹ This son's name was Hipparinus or, according to another authority, Aretaeus.² After Dion's death, about the beginning of the year 353 B. C., Callippus became ruler of Syracuse for thirteen months.³ In the meantime Dion's loyal followers took refuge with Hiketas in Leontini.⁴ Dion's wife Arete was in prison at Syracuse, where she gave birth to a posthumous son, who is nowhere named.⁵ Plato's message to Dion's friends, contained in the seventh Epistle, was composed during this period.

In the year 352 Dion's nephew Hipparinus, son of Dionysius the Elder and half-brother of Dionysius the Younger, captured Syracuse and released, with the rest of Dion's family, his posthumous son less than a year old.⁶ Since this success of Hipparinus is referred to in the eighth Epistle, it must have been written, if by Plato, at about this time.

¹ Plutarch, *Dion*, 55.

² Plutarch, *Dion*, 31.

³ Diodorus XVI, 31, 7.

⁴ Diodorus XVI, 36, 5; Plutarch, *Timoleon*, 1.

⁵ Plutarch, *Dion*, 57.

⁶ Diodorus XVI, 36, 5; Plutarch, *Dion*, 58.

Hipparinus died in 350.⁷ Hiketas of Leontini later deserted the cause of Dion and caused Dion's family to be murdered, among them the nameless son born posthumously in prison.⁸

There are two questions to be dealt with in connection with the seventh and eighth Epistles. In the first place, who is the Hipparinus referred to in the introduction to the seventh Epistle (324a)? This question has been satisfactorily discussed by Adam,⁹ with whom Howalt (*Die Briefe Platons*, Zurich, 1923) in his note on this passage agrees. Dion's son Hipparinus Aretaeus (he probably received the second name to distinguish him from his cousin) was dead. In any case, if Plato had supposed him to be alive, he would have mentioned him in different terms from those which he actually uses. The Hipparinus of the letter is said to be of the same age as Dion at a time when the latter was twenty years old.¹⁰ This is too old for Dion's son, whom Plutarch calls *ἀντίπαις*,¹¹ that is, not yet eighteen years old. It is not too young for Dion's nephew, even if we hold the writer to the exact year. Dionysius married Dion's sister Aristomache in 398,¹² and we have no reason to doubt that she might have borne sons twenty-five years later at the age of forty. Moreover, it evidently did not occur to Plutarch that this Hipparinus could be Dion's son, for if it had, he would have cited Plato as authority for the name, when he made that a subject of discussion (Dion 31). Since the nephew Hipparinus was actually in command of support at Leontini a little later, it is natural to suppose that he was being considered by Dion's friends as a possible leader shortly after Dion's death. Some have thought that there is a reference to this nephew of Dion in Ep. VII, 328a, where it is suggested that the companionship of Dion's nephews would be an incitement to Dionysius to study philosophy (in the year 367), and that consequently he must

⁷ Diodorus XVI, 36, 5.

⁸ Plutarch, Dion, 58; Timoleon, 33.

⁹ R. Adam, *Die Echtheit der Platonischen Briefe*, Programm, Berlin, 1906.

¹⁰ Ep. VII, 324a. If Nepos is accurate in giving Dion's age at death as 55 years, he must have been at least twenty years old when Plato first visited Syracuse in 388.

¹¹ Plutarch, Dion 55.

¹² Diodorus XIV, 45, 1.

have been more than twenty years old in 353. If, however, we can trust the scholiast on Epistle IV, the brothers of Dionysius the Elder had both married sisters of Dion. Hence there existed in all probability at the Syracusan court many nephews of Dion of about the same age as Dionysius the Younger, and this reference would be to them and not to Hipparinus. There is accordingly no discrepancy involved in identifying the Hipparinus of the seventh Epistle with the nephew of Dion who was preparing to lead Dion's friends against Callippus.

The question that concerns the eighth Epistle, however, is still in need of an answer. The writer of that Epistle refers (355e) to a son of Dion as being alive when the letter was written, more than a year after Dion's only son had met his death. There are just four possible methods of explaining this reference: 1. The writer did not know of the death of Dion's son. 2. The writer is referring to Dion's second son born posthumously. 3. Our authorities are wrong and Dion's son had *not* died. 4. Our authorities are wrong in their statement that it was Dion's *only* son who died.

All of these methods have found scholars to advocate them at some time. No one in recent years has, however, adopted the second among the four possibilities, in spite of the fact that it is the only one that avoids the difficulties involved in supposing that Plutarch and Plato were in disagreement. That the solution of the problem really lies after all in supposing that it is Dion's posthumous infant who is referred to in the eighth Epistle is, I believe, proved by certain considerations that I proceed to state.

We have in the first place two convincing arguments for this view. To begin with, Plutarch, who was well informed about all that concerns Plato and Dion, evidently agreed with this view, for he would otherwise certainly have discussed the discrepancy between his account and Plato's. His discussion of a less important disagreement elsewhere (Dion 20) makes this plain. Plutarch's interpretation deserves to be decisive unless there are strong arguments against it that Plutarch was not capable of estimating properly; and such arguments do not exist.

My second convincing argument is based on the curious way in which Plato, in the passage of the eighth Epistle that has

been referred to, introduces Dion's son merely as a representative of his father and grandfather. It is proposed to create three kings, all descendants of the original Hipparinus and Dionysius. In the case of each of the other two candidates for kingship Plato makes the most of the man's name and of any worthy achievements or characteristics that he has to his credit. Dion's son apparently is nameless and undistinguished in what he has done and in what he is. The only possible explanation for such featurelessness is that the son referred to is precisely the nameless infant who had just come to light. Rightly considered Plato's reticence fairly shouts the truth in our ears. Coupled with Plutarch's silence it is overwhelming evidence.

In addition to the foregoing, moreover, we have strongly corroborative items of evidence. There are two circumstances worthy of note which, on any other view, demand an explanation that is not to be elicited. Once considered in the light of the interpretation here proposed, however, they become significant and harmonize perfectly with the series of events. In the first place, why, if a son of Dion was known to be in existence throughout, is he mentioned only in the eighth Epistle, and not at all (as a successor to Dion) in the seventh, whose author is so concerned to vindicate the memory of Dion and to ensure the continuance of his political program and party? A living son of Dion would surely have received the allegiance of his friends; in that case no one would have turned to Hipparinus the nephew. The author of the seventh Epistle knew that Dion's son was dead; the author of the eighth was willing to make the most of the fortunate discovery of a posthumous infant who might represent his cause.

The second circumstance which is illuminated by the present interpretation is Plutarch's twice repeated statement that Hike-tas of Leontini had Dion's sister, wife and infant son destroyed at sea. Plato's eighth letter evidently had its effect, and Dion's son did become a focus for the loyalty of Dion's followers. We have a striking parallel to the situation of this infant in the strife that centered about the posthumous son of Alexander the Great, thirty years later. In the confusion that followed the death of his father he was doomed to perish, the innocent victim of a heritage too great for a helpless babe.

Up to this point nothing has been mentioned that would account for the neglect of this proposed solution, obvious as it seems, by practically all students of the Epistles. The stumbling-block is found in the language used by Plato, Epistle VIII, 357bc, which I will quote: *ἔστιν δὲ ταῦτα οὐκ ἀδύνατα · ἃ γὰρ ἐν δυοῖν τε ὄντα ψυχαῖν τυγχάνει καὶ λογισαμένοις εὐρεῖν βέλτιστα ἐτοίμως ἔχει, ταῦτα δὲ σχεδὸν ὁ κρίνων ἀδύνατα οὐκ εὖ φρονεῖ. λέγω δὲ τὰς δύο τήν τε Ἰππαρίνου τοῦ Διονυσίου υἱέος καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐμοῦ υἱέος · τοῦτοι γὰρ συνομολογησάντων τοῖς γε ἄλλοις Συνακοσίοις οἶμαι πᾶσιν ὅσοι περ τῆς πόλεως κήδονται συνδοκεῖν.* Can Plato possibly mean to mention as one of the two minds that possess his ideals that of an infant in arms? Let us not answer in the negative until we have examined the alternative very carefully. Plato had great faith in heredity and in education. It is at least possible that in the absence of solid grounds he set all his hope on the expectation that Dion's son would follow in his father's steps. It is like Plato to be most emphatic when he is most paradoxical. Fantastic as Plato's proposal becomes if we suppose that it concerns such an infant, surely it is not more fantastic than other proposals in this letter, or in the dialogs of Plato for that matter, when they are examined in the light of actual conditions. This passage is hardly so conclusive as it has been supposed to be.

The possibility that Plato may have the infant in mind here once admitted, let us see whether there are any indications in the language of the passage that will turn the possibility into a probability. Why does Plato employ the expression *λογισαμένοις εὐρεῖν βέλτιστα ἐτοίμως ἔχει* in coördination with *ἐν δυοῖν ὄντα ψυχαῖν τυγχάνει*? Is it that he spoke first of his ideals as already in the minds of two persons (among the three recommended for the kingship, it turns out that Plato means), then added what may be taken as a qualification of his too bold assertion, the statement that (at least) the way is open for anyone (hence *a fortiori* for Dion's son), once he has given due thought to the matter, to discover the excellence of these ideals and so to possess them later and join in making them effective? Plato's language is, I believe, influenced by his consciousness that he is speaking of an infant; he reserves something of his meaning and the construction shifts to follow the shifting thought.

In the last sentence that I have quoted there is a similar shift of construction and an indication that the expected concurrence of the two minds lies some way in the future. Plato says: "When these two *have* come to an agreement, I am sure that all the other Syracusans, at any rate all who have their city's welfare at heart, *are* in accord." Richards' proposal to add *ἀν* after *συνδοκεῖν* would to be sure improve the form of the sentence. As it stands, however, its very irregularity well indicates Plato's wish to speak of the future as already present. We have to translate less literally as follows: "The rest of the Syracusans who have the city's welfare at heart are in accord, I am sure; we need only wait for these two to arrive at an agreement." There would be no such occasion for a period of waiting, except for the fact that one of the two had still to develop for many years before becoming capable of appreciating Plato's ideals.

To sum up, we have adequate evidence that Dion's elder son, Hipparinus Aretaeus, is not named in Plato's Epistles and that he is not referred to in the eighth Epistle. This was the opinion of Plutarch, who is in this case a particularly competent authority, and it is the only opinion that squares with the facts. Even the passage most difficult to explain on the assumption that this view is correct, is found on examination to be, if still a stumbling-block, at least not an insuperable one, and to have peculiarities that need the present hypothesis to explain them.

With the removal of this supposed historical discrepancy the way is clear to accepting the evidence of style and thought and considering the eighth Epistle a genuine work of Plato, who here uses a literary form developed by Isocrates and frequently employed by his contemporaries to put a political program before the public. The Letter is already accepted as genuine by such competent authorities as Burnet, Wilamowitz, Ritter and Eduard Meyer, not to mention others, and it is not unworthy to rank as a Platonic contribution to ephemeral literature.

L. A. Post.

VI.—THE INDEFINITE FIRST SINGULAR.

Frequent association with the subjunctive mood has drawn a great deal of attention to the indefinite second singular; but the corresponding use of the first person has passed almost unnoticed.

Many of the best cases are found in passages where a speaker, needing two indefinites, introduces *ego* as a foil to *tu*. This situation is reflected in the colloquial "*meum* and *tuum*," as when it is said of a person of questionable honesty: "His ideas of *meum* and *tuum* are somewhat confused."

Thus used, the words *meum* and *tuum* do not refer to the speaker and hearer. They are quite indefinite in scope, connoting something like "one's own property" and "the property of others." Cf.:

Cicero, Tusc. Disp. v. 63: In hoc enim genere nescio quo pacto magis quam in aliis suum cuique pulchrum est. Adhuc neminem cognovi poetam, et mihi fuit cum Aquinio amicitia, qui sibi non optimus videretur. Sic se res habet; *te tua, me* delectant *mea*.

This passage has to do with a poet's predilection for his own compositions. The tenor is general throughout; and, at the end, *te* and *tua* are certainly indefinite, for they could have no application to the hazily conceived young interlocutor.

Though Cicero himself was a writer of verse, it is quite likely that *me* and *mea* are meant to be equally indefinite; in fact, to make the words specific would seem to put the speaker and Aquinius in the same class—a meaning which we may be sure that Cicero did not intend to suggest!

Juvenal, III. 288 ff.:

Miserae cognosce prooemia rixae,
Si rixa est, ubi *tu* pulsas, *ego* vapulo tantum.
Stat contra starique iubet; parere necesse est;
Nam quid *agas*, cum *te* furiosus cogat et idem
Fortior?

This satire represents a friend of Juvenal's as shaking from his feet the dust of Rome. At the gate, he pauses long enough to set forth the miseries of city life that cause him to seek a

quieter abode. Among other things, he mentions the propensity of roistering blades to rove about at night in quest of defenseless victims they may abuse.

In the lines quoted, there is no reference to Juvenal, of course; *tu* is the typical bully, and *ego* is the peaceable pedestrian: "Hear now the start of a wretched brawl—if brawl it is, where one party does the beating, and the other suffers all the blows."

This example is particularly interesting because, just two lines farther on, the case of the victim is shifted to the indefinite second singular (note *agas* and *te*), while further reference to the bully now requires the third person (*furiosus cogat*). Compare also the following:

Juvenal, XVI. 17 ff.:

Iustissima centurionum
Cognitio est igitur de milite; nec *mihi* deerit
Ultio, si iustae defertur causa querellae.
Tota cohors tamen est inimica, omnesque manipuli
Consensu magno efficiunt, curabilis ut sit
Vindicta et gravior quam iniuria. Dignum erit ergo
Declamatoris mulino corde Vagelli,
Cum duo crura *habeas*, offendere tot caligas, tot
Milia clavorum.

There is a reference here to the difficulty that confronts the civilian in the fact that a case against a soldier can be tried only in a military court. In such a court, the civilian may indeed secure a verdict in his favor, but at the risk of incurring further hurt at the hands of the soldier's friends.

At the outset, the civilian is typified by the indefinite first person (*mihi*), with a shift later to the indefinite second (*Cum duo crura habeas*).

The use of indefinite *tu* and *ego* as typifying two opposing parties lends itself readily to lively, dramatic effects; e. g.

Cicero, de Off. ii. 83 ff.; Habitent gratis in alieno. Quid ita? ut, cum *ego* emerim, aedificarim, tuear, impendam, *tu* me invito fruarere meo? Quid est aliud aliis sua eripere, aliis dare aliena? Tabulae vero quid habent argumenti, nisi ut *emas mea* pecunia fundum, eum *tu* habeas, *ego* non habeam pecuniam?

Cicero here is discussing the evils of confiscation and cancellation of debts. Midway in the passage, the two factions affected by such measures are referred to by the colorless *aliis* . . .

aliis. The difference in style incident to the employment of indefinite *tu* and *ego* is well illustrated at the beginning and the end of the citation. So again:

Cicero, in Verr. ii. 3. 193: *Tu*, cum tibi *ego* frumentum in meis agris atque in mea civitate, denique in iis locis, in quibus versaris, rem geris, provinciam administras, paratus sim dare, angulum *mihi* aliquem eligas provinciae reconditum ac derelictum? iubeas ibi *me* metiri, quo portare non expediat, ubi emere non possim?

This passage has to do with the abuses incident to the collection of taxes in Sicily during the period of Verres' misrule. The Roman official is represented by *tu*, while *ego* stands for the agricultural interests generally. Though not himself an aggrieved provincial, Cicero naturally uses the first person for the party with which he is in sympathy.

Though some of the best examples of the indefinite first singular are found in passages where there is antithesis to indefinite *tu*, there are good cases also where *ego* lacks such balance, notably in connections where a general principle is laid down and followed by one or more illustrations; e. g.

Cicero, p. Caec. 74: *Mihi* credite, maior hereditas uni cuique nostrum venit in isdem bonis a iure et a legibus quam ab iis, a quibus illa ipsa bona nobis relictasunt. Nam ut perveniat ad *me* fundus, testamento alicuius fieri potest; ut retineam quod *meum* factum sit, sine iure civili fieri non potest.

Seneca, de Ira, iii. 34. 1 ff.: Crede *mihi*, levia sunt propter quae non leviter excandescimus, qualia quae pueros in rixam et iurgium concitant; . . . auferre hic *mihi* hereditatem voluit; hic *me* diu in spem supremam captatis criminatus est; hic scortum *meum* concupivit.

As above noted, interest in the indefinite second singular has hitherto rather overshadowed the corresponding use of the first person. But the latter must be taken into account in any comprehensive treatment of indefinite uses.

H. C. NUTTING.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

REPORTS

HERMES, Vol. LVIII (1923), Nos. 3 and 4.

Die Feldzüge Antiochos' des Groszen nach Kleinasien und Thrakien (241-287). O. Leuze continues his study of the chronology of these campaigns. He devotes considerable space to prove that P. Scipio Africanus was not sent as an ambassador to Antiochus in the year 193 B. C., as Acilius stated (cf. Livy XXXV 14, 5-12), nor in the year 192 B. C. as Nissen conjectured. Neither did he go there on a tour of investigation in 193 as Holleaux tried to show (cf. A. J. P. 38, 213). The story of Scipio's interview with Hannibal dealing with the ranking of generals is one of the numerous legends that were invented to glorify Scipio.

Vergil's Sechste Ekloge (288-304). G. Jachmann shows that Vergil followed a plan in his enumeration of the Silenus songs. The first one tells of origins down to animals roaming on mountains; then continues with the ancestors of the human race, the age of Saturn and concludes with Prometheus who introduced the age of invention. After this follows a catalogue of songs of love and transformation, myths that are at least formally related. The Hylas myth seems to form a transition. The strong contrast presented by the Gallus poem only heightens the honor that Vergil conferred upon his friend. Jachmann develops his idea with interesting discussions of Apollonius' *Argonautica* (I 496 ff.), Verg. Georg. IV 345 ff.; II 475 ff., Ovid *Ars Am.* II 467 etc. The cosmogony of the first song was clearly not derived from Lucretius as shown by vv. 32, 33: *semina terrarumque animaeque marisque . . . et liquidi simul ignis*, the term *semina* notwithstanding. On the other hand Vergil did not derive the idea of four elements from Empedocles or the Stoa, but more probably from a popular conception.

Zur Textkritik der Dionysiaka des Nonnos (305-321). H. Tiedke discusses and emends a number of passages of the *Dionysiaca*, and supports his conjectures largely with the usage of Nonnus.

Metrische Beiträge (322-326). K. Münscher after expressing high praise of Wilamowitz' *Griechische Verskunst* (1921), takes exception to his treatment of the Alcaic verse; viz., whereas Wilamowitz l. c. II ch. 13 believes that Horace's caesura separated original elements of verse: $\approx - \cup - - - - \cup \cup \cup - \cup \approx$, Münscher holds that the Alcaic verse was composed of an iambic member, followed by a Telesilleion ($\approx - \cup \cup \cup - \cup \approx$). Nor did Horace derive his theory of long syllables and caesuras from a book on

meters. Horace with Roman strictness made a rule of what was only a tendency (cf. A. J. P. XLIV 73).

Synkrisis (327-368). F. Focke gives a detailed account of the comparison of persons and things in Greek and Roman literature in order to show the historical elements and traditional *γένος* in the brief comparisons appended to the *Lives* of Plutarch who, saturated with the ancient culture, produced in these comparisons the fruit of his old age. That he was conscious of the agon motif is shown in Theseus I: *τοιῶδε φωτὶ κτλ.*; this popular motif was also influential in later European literature. Many examples are extant of its use in ancient times, viz.: certamen Homeri et Hesiodi, *δίκαιος καὶ ἄδικος Λόγος* in Arist. Clouds, comparisons between philosopher and king (Alexander and Diogenes) etc. Such topics were adopted in the rhetorical schools, and the influence of rhetoric shows itself early. Writers of encomia were fond of finding resemblances, for which mythology and art furnished abundant material. That the encomium must introduce distinguished parallels was recommended by Aristotle (Rhet. I 9, 1368a 19) and Anaximenes (§ 35, p. 83, Sp.-H) and was exemplified by Isocrates in his Euagoras. Focke continues with a discussion of literary criticism, which was dominated by ethical standards, and of historiography, which began with comparative ethnography (cf. Herodotus and Hippocrates π. ἀέρων, ὑδάτων, τόπων). The sources of Plutarch's comparisons have received little attention, whereas a flood of literature has covered the *Lives*. Focke shows that Solon's poems, Timaeus and rhetorical teaching furnished some data that are not found in the *Lives*. That Plutarch practised the art of eulogistic comparison in his youth is shown by his 2. declamation: π. τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τύχης ἢ ἀρετῆς; and in these comparisons rhetorical doctrine can be shown in detail. As regards their evident ethical purpose, Leo has shown that this feature originated in the Peripatetic school. It became a habit with Plutarch in the course of his ethical studies. The comparison of Roman with Greek characters had become a tradition long before Plutarch's time, for which Panaetius and Polybius had laid the foundation.

Neue Bruchstücke des Römischen Festkalenders (369-392). Georg Wissowa discusses recent notable additions to the *Fasti*, which had received only few additions since Mommsen published his second edition in CIL, I². He takes up in order fragments found at Ostia, Praeneste and Antium. At the last place more than 300 fragments of stucco with letters painted in black and red were found and have been admirably pieced together. These stucco fragments revealed themselves as the remains of a pre-Julian calendar with its 355 days, in many respects a most important discovery. For example it confirms several of Ovid's

dates of temple foundations. The Praeneste calendar fixes Oct. 23 as the date of the second battle at Philippi.

Die Betriebsformen des Griechischen Handels im IV. Jahrh. (393-425). J. Hasebroek gives a detailed picture of Greek commerce during the IV century B. C., based mainly on the orators, as he did of the banking system (cf. A. J. P. XLII 346). There was no business by commission, which did not arise until after the middle ages; no system of transportation between definite ports; no bills of lading. The foreign trade was originally in the hands of ship owners, who carried their own goods to market (*ναύκληροι*); but as they had room, not only for passengers (originally *ἐμποροι*, later *ἐπιβάται*), but also for additional freight, a class of traders arose who paid freight charges and accompanied their goods either in person or by a representative; these were known as *ἐμποροι*. From the frequency of this practice, *ἐμπορος* became a general term to designate the foreign trader, including the *ναύκληρος*, who never became a mere freighter. In juxtaposition the *ναύκληρος* was a trader who owned the vessel, in contrast with the *ἐμπορος* (or at times *ἐπιβάτης*), who paid freight charges. In either case the goods were always accompanied by the owner, or his representative, to foreign ports where they were exhibited and sold in bulk or at retail. The *ναύκληρος*, as owner of the ship, had the advantage of being able to change his destination, if he happened to hear of a better market for his goods, and better prospects for a return cargo, an important consideration in view of the limited circulation of local coinage. The advantage offered by Athens is shown in Xenophon (De Vectig. III 2). The *ἐμπορος* at times was compelled to transfer his goods to another vessel. This foreign trade was largely dependent on capital borrowed on bottomry or the hypothecated cargo, and it is noteworthy that the lender, or his representative, would be among the passengers, unless he had an agent at the port of destination to guard his interests. Witnesses generally took the place of written acknowledgments, which became common later (cf. the ostraca and papyri of Egypt). Documentary evidence was confined to loans on bottomry and hypothecated goods, and on return of the loan the document was destroyed. The article contains numerous other details and instructive illustrations from the orators.

Protogamia, Zum Montanismus und Donatismus in Africa (426-440). E. Bickel interprets an inscription found at Carthage in the year 1900 (CIL VIII Suppl. 4 (1916) 25045), which E. Seckel (Berl. Sitzungsab. 1921 p. 989 ff.) calls "ein kirchenrechtliches Denkmal des Montanismus." After a discussion of the sects of Montanists and Donatists in Africa and especially Tertullian's relation to the former, he shows that the term patriarchae of the inscription is explained by the excessive

adoration of bishops by the Donatists. Likewise the term *protogamia* has reference to the refusal of the Donatists to recognize any sacrament excepting their own, hence while advocating monogamy, they excepted marriages that had preceded adoption into their sect, which provision included the spiritual marriages of nuns, the chief grievance of the Catholics. The language of the inscription also points to the IV century A. D.

Eine Doppelfassung in den Sophistenbiographien des Eunapios (441-447). Kurt Latte cites a passage from Photius which describes a *νέα ἔκδοσις* of Eunapius' histories, which, according to Photius, was less violent in its attacks upon the Christians. Latte agrees with Lundström that this revision had been made by Eunapius himself, which some scholars have doubted. A trace of this *νέα ἔκδοσις* appears in a passage of the *Βίοι Σοφιστῶν* which Latte discusses.

Kallinikos von Petrai (448-456). A. Stein examines the data in Suidas s. v. Καλλίνικος, κακοζηλία, Γενέθλιος and Ἰουλιανὸς Δόμνον and concludes that Callinicus belonged to the second half of the III century A. D. The Lupus to whom he dedicated his *Περὶ κακοζηλίας ῥητορικῆς* was probably Virius Lupus who was consul ordinarius in the year 278 A. D. More interesting is the conjecture that the Cleopatra to whom he dedicated his Alexandrian history was Zenobia of Palmyra, who during her brief rule over Egypt adopted the name Cleopatra.

Miscellen: F. Jacoby (457-458) estimates the length of Anaximenes' history of Alexander and concludes that it contained five books rather than nine as Didymus states (cf. i. Demosth. col. 9, 43 ff.).—E. Orth (459-460) emends Bacchylides XVIII (XVII Bl.) 16 νέ]ον to δόμ]ον.—J. Wackernagel (460-464), under the title *Onomatologica*, emends Varro l. l. IX 55 enuus enua, which had been changed to Ennius Ennia, to Aemilius Aemilia; Cic. Verr. IV 148 Theoractum to Theoplactum (cf. θεόπλακτος in Hesychius); Latreus to Elatreus in Ovid Met. 12, 458; and finally discusses mistakes in transliterating Iranian names: Μεγάβυζος for Μεγάβυξος, Ἰνταφρένης and Ἀρταφρένης for —φρένης (due to folk-etymology), Ἀγαβάτανα (Wilamowitz, Aesch. Pers. 961) for Ἀγβάτανα. The collateral Ἐκβάτανα was due to ἐκβαίνω.—J. Mussehl (465) acknowledges the precedence of Crusius (cf. Philolog. LXV (1906) p. 159 f.) in explaining Martial's epig. Alphius—Olphius according to A and Ω.—Corrigenda (465) to article Synkrisis p. 327 ff.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

ROMANIA, Vol. XLIX, Nos. 1-4.

Pp. 1-47. D. S. Blondheim, Essai d'un vocabulaire comparatif des parlers romans des Juifs au moyen âge. A previous

article by the same author was published in the *Romania* in 1910 under the title *Contribution à la lexicographie française d'après des sources rabbiniques*. Dr. Blondheim's researches have now been extended to include besides French and Spanish dialects also those of the Provençal, Catalan, Portuguese and Italian Jews. The texts utilized as a basis for this new study were for the most part translations of portions of the Bible, and this work on the sources was largely made possible by the assistance of many well-known scholars both in Europe and America, especially those interested in the study of Jewish dialects. The translations, it is contended, are ultimately derived from the Greek Bible, through Vulgar Latin forms related to the *Vetus Latina*. The latter, it is asserted, underwent Jewish influence. The work is arranged alphabetically, and the present instalment comprises the letters A to E.

Pp. 48-62. E. Droz, Notice sur un recueil de louanges. Three copies are known of a small book entitled *Les louenges a nostre seigneur || A nostre dame et aux benoitz sains || et saintes de paradis*. It was printed for Antoine Verard shortly after the year 1500 in all probability. The author of this article refrains from giving a complete description, preferring for his part to call attention to several interesting pieces which it contains and to mention the names of some dozen hitherto unknown authors. Of the latter we may note those of Jehan de Cerisy, Pierre Hesglache, Tibault, Regnault Gorra, Amauri Marie, Anthoine Tiart, Frère Jean Bisquet, Gervais Targer, Nicolas Bassereau, Julian Lelest, Jehan Panier, Nicole Petit and Colas Jougon. The literary notes on this period left by the late M. Emile Picot have furnished some of the material used in this article.

Pp. 63-97. Pio Rajna, Varietà provenzali. I. Per la datazione della *Sancta Fides d'Agen*. II. Bernart de Ventadorn, *Qan l'erba fresca*. III. Il più antico trovatore italiano. The veteran Romance scholar of Italy here identifies one of the characters "Corbarin" mentioned in the first poem with Kerbogha, emir of Mossul, defeated by the Christians in the First Crusade, on June 28, 1098. This supplies a probable date for the composition of the poem in question while the heathenish name was in everybody's mouth. In the second section a refutation of Appel's views as to certain rhyming habits of the troubadours is given, and corruption in the manuscript tradition is alleged to be at the bottom of the whole question. The third section calls attention to the fact that Provençal lyrics were written down by the scribes from memory in many instances no doubt, and not copied from earlier manuscripts solely, as is often assumed by modern scholars. Starting out from this basis the author investigates the claims of the oldest Italian troubadour.

Pp. 98-117. *Mélanges*:—Johan Vising, *Encore une fois Desver, Resver*.—Antoine Thomas, "La feste de la Moutouse."—J. Anglade, *A propos de Peire Vidal*, I-VI.—† Gertrude Schoepperle (Mrs. R. S. Loomis) *Pour le commentaire de Villon*; *Note sur la Ballade des menus propos*.

Pp. 118-126. *Discussions*:—Lucien Foulet, *L'ordre des mots et l'analyse de la phrase*.

Pp. 127-137. *Comptes rendus*.

Pp. 138-150. *Périodiques*.

Pp. 151-160. *Chronique*.

Pp. 161-185. O. H. Prior, *Remarques sur l'anglo-normand*. The history of the French language in England after the Norman conquest has long occupied the attention of scholars, and varying views have been freely expressed. The writer of the present article feels inclined to assume a stronger influence of the native language on the imported French tongue than has hitherto been conceded. Witness, for instance, the jargon called "law French," which persisted almost down to our own times. An extensive investigation of the English dialects and their influence on the French brought over from the continent is needed before these linguistic questions can be definitely settled.

Pp. 186-203. Maurice Mann, *La couleur perse en ancien français et chez Dante*. Modern French dictionaries state that this is the name of various shades of blue, but Italian dictionaries give to the corresponding word in their language the meaning "deep red." "Violet" would be a better translation at the present day to designate the color connoted by the Old French term.

Pp. 204-259. Edmond Faral, *La pastourelle*. I.—L'élément aristocratique: 1. Les théories en cours. 2. Examen nouveau des textes. (1.) L'action et les situations. (2.) Les caractères, les sentiments et les mœurs. II.—L'élément savant: 1. Les théories en cours. 2. Examen nouveau des faits. Conclusion. As the result of his painstaking investigations the author concludes that the "pastourelle" is eminently aristocratic, that under the influence of Virgil it is also learned in the Mediæval sense.

Pp. 260-282. *Mélanges*:—Paul Marchot, *Sur le plus ancien texte rétique*.—Albert Dauzat, **Gaba et ses dérivés*.—L. Clédât, *Les anciennes locutions formées avec "ainsi"*.—H. Chaytor, *Fragment of the Roman de Troie*.—Antoine Thomas, *Les plus anciennes mançons du Roman de Berinus*.—Jessie L. Weston, *Notes on the Grail romances: Caput Johannis = Corpus Christi*.—E.-G. Léonard, *Note sur le ms. B. N. lat. 17730*.

Pp. 283-300. Comptes rendus.

Pp. 301-312. Périodiques.

Pp. 313-320. Chronique.

Pp. 321-342. R. Fawtier et E. C. Fawtier-Jones, Notice du manuscrit French 6 de la John Rylands Library, Manchester. This manuscript formerly belonged to Lord Crawford, and it contains only twelve leaves which are fragments of two or three different codices of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It may possibly be no. 1119 of the Libri collection as described in the catalogue. Our manuscript contains a series of French texts which are preserved in only a few copies, two of them only in this copy. The most important one is *La vie de Saint Alexis* as edited by Gaston Paris, but only a portion of the text is here preserved.

Pp. 343-388. D. S. Blondheim, Essai d'un vocabulaire comparatif des parlers romans des Juifs au moyen âge (suite). This second instalment includes the letters F to P.

Pp. 389-416. J. Jud, Mots d'origine gauloise? Troisième série. Only six words and groups of words are investigated in this new series, the best known of them being the French words *Auvent* and *Blé*.

Pp. 417-432. Mélanges:—Georges Thouvenin, Le fabliau de "L'oue au chapelein" et une légende orientale.—L. Clédât, Livre, issu de Libra, a-t-il les deux genres? (quoting Laubscher, *The syntactical causes of case reduction in Old French*).—L. Clédât, L'article défini devant les adjectifs numéraux.—J. Anglade, A propos d'une pièce de Peire Vidal.—Pierre Champion, Trois ballades inconnues de Meschinot.

Pp. 433-452. Comptes rendus.

Pp. 453-467. Périodiques.

Pp. 468-480. Chronique.

Pp. 481-525. E. Tappolet, Les noms gallo-romans du moyen. This article is divided into three parts as follows: I. Partie technique; II. Partie psychologique; III. Partie historique. Several illustrations of old Gallic hubs and an entire wheel give added interest to a complicated linguistic investigation, which is founded in part on the *Atlas linguistique de la France*. A great variety of dialectal forms are here discussed.

Pp. 526-569. D. S. Blondheim, Essai d'un vocabulaire comparatif des parlers romans des Juifs au moyen âge. This third instalment includes the letters P (contd.) to Z, the whole series having been divided into 166 sub-heads.

Pp. 570-591. Mélanges:—Amos Parducci, Johannes de

Bransilva.—Pierre Champion, A propos de Charles d'Orléans: I. La dame anglaise de Charles d'Orléans; II. Recueils imprimés contenant des poésies de Charles d'Orléans.—Grace Frank, The sources of the oldest known edition of Villon.

Pp. 592-597. Discussions:—E. Hoepffner, Pers en ancien français.

Pp. 598-613. Comptes rendus.

Pp. 614-623. Périodiques.

Pp. 624-632. Chronique.

Pp. 633-640. Table des matières.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

REVIEWS.

T. Lucreti Cari de rerum natura recensuit emendavit supplevit
HERMANNUS DIELS. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1923. xliv, 410 pp. 8vo.

Diels' fame rests securely on his work in Greek philosophy but throughout his long life he was interested in Lucretius, and in his student days at Bonn his first *Seminararbeit* was a paper on that poet. In his last illness during June 1923 he corrected the proof of this book as far as the end of Book iv, and the printing of the remainder was supervised by his pupil Mewaldt. He had planned a commentary on the poem; and it is an irreparable loss to science that through the temporum iniquitate, as he says, the commentary will never appear. But a volume containing a German translation may be soon expected.

The book is a handsome specimen of the printer's art and is equal to the best of the ante bellum productions of the German press. It is rubricated throughout, and dedicated in a rubricated Greek elegiac distich to his friend and associate of fifty-five years—Φιλομωμυχίδη, doubtless the great Berlin Hellenist. The preface contains a full description of the manuscripts, of the characteristics severally of the archetype, the ancient testimonia, the orthography of the edition, and its general plan. Then follow six pages of the text of the ancient testimonia, the text of the poem with rubricated headings, rubricated capitula, and rubricated initial letters for the main divisions of the argument. As a further assistance in following the course of the exposition there is wide spacing to distinguish the major parts of the discussion. Testimonia are printed below the text and at the foot of the page the critical apparatus. After the poem, the fragments are given, and at

the end of the book a critical supplement containing all the less important variants of the principal manuscripts.

The edition is the logical successor of Lachmann's famous recension of 1850, and to a great degree will take its place in Germany as the most elaborate edition of the poem. Lachmann lived only one year after the publication of his edition that was the crown of his life work; Diels was less fortunate. Both of the books are the last contributions to learning of scholars of the first rank, and the numerous uncomplimentary references to Lachmann's conjectures, that are printed by Diels in his apparatus, are to be explained by the fact that until Diels, no German edition of Lucretius, worthy of the name, has appeared since Lachmann's time, and Diels would have his work compared directly with that of Lachmann.

The text is founded on the Leyden manuscripts, O and Q, and equal authority to these, so far as they go, is given to the Gottorpien and Vienna fragments. The Laurentian codices Diels regards as ultimately copies of the OQ class and he gives them no independent authority. All of the principal manuscripts go back to a lost codex of the vii century, and that to a lost archetype. Diels identifies the first corrector of O as Otloh of Emeram, who corrected the manuscript at Fulda in the xi century, and who was a critic of the first order. Diels thinks that the Poggian codices were influenced by some manuscripts of the Q class, a position that to the reviewer seems dubious. The original edition of the poem was put together under M. Cicero's authority; Diels thinks by Atticus; and there is no trace in Cicero of any knowledge of Lucretius.

Diels has endeavored to restore the original orthography of Lucretian Latin so far as to introduce a certain 'rusticity'; and here, I think, he has gone too far. He is not unscientific in this matter as were Wakefield and Forbiger; yet if any one of the principal manuscripts and any correction of them points to an ancient form, he seizes on it. Many of the forms will be accepted, such as the nom. pl. in -is already restored by Munro, frudem, quasei, probarei, sei, quatinus, sordeis; but such monstrous shapes as quocturnicibus, quoquere, utrimsequos, after the Lucilian fashion, are very doubtful. While I think that the longer form nihil should be restored, I cannot approve of nihilum beginning a metrical foot, nor of vehementer under similar circumstances. No apocope of s is indicated (e. g. i 591 inmutabilis materiae) which leads to the strange posterioribus signis in v 627. And yet Diels' courage failed him in some matters: he does not accept veluti of the manuscripts before a vowel, and he writes opportuna in spite of oportuna of the codices; ungentum he passes over in vi 974. Adque is a favorite form and ad for at, quead, essed, capud, and even emineadque in iii 284; and reliquid and quod for quot. And yet in

ii 516 he prints *remensumst* where I follow O with *remensust*; and although O has *optulit* in iii 1041, Diels follows Q¹ in writing *obtulit*; in iii 179 *persubtilem* of Q where O has *persuptilem*, and in iv 425 *adsimili* where O¹ has *atsimili*. Diels capitalizes *Leti* in i 1112, ii 960, iii 42, 67, and *Formidinis* at iv 173. *Leti* was so personified by Conington on *Georg.* iv 481, and Wakefield personified *Formidinis*. In general I feel that Diels would have been wiser if he had followed O alone in his spelling.

The text continues, and in a way concludes, the revolt against Lachmann that has appeared in ever increasing measure in the work of Bernays, Munro, Brieger, Giussani, Bailey, Ernout, and (*salva verecundia*) the reviewer. The net result is an agreement with Wakefield although these modern Lucretians by no means have been following at his heels, as was said once by an arrogant British critic. Wakefield's critical method, so far as he had one, differed *toto caelo* from that of Lachmann and his successors, yet *post hoc propter hoc* does not apply here. I have counted 34 places where the Ms. reading is first recalled by Diels since Wakefield (excepting several instances in the reviewer's text of 1917): for example *sumum* i 555 and *extremum* ii 1116, a before s in ii 1135, iv 1122, vi 1047; *remedii* vi 1226, *canceris* v 617, *nymphis* vi 1178. Others have anticipated Diels in recalling the mss.; the writer at ii 112, 850, 1165, v 186, vi 250, 600; Forbiger at ii 805; W. A. Baehrens at iv 324; Bockemueller at vi 483; Ellis at vi 971; the old vulgate at v 182, vi 519, and Shackler at v 182;—all without acknowledgement by Diels, who may be forgiven for overlooking such a trivial matter. But Diels is first to recall *ulla* at i 667, *inane* 1009, *mente* (nom.) ii 18 and iii 240, *tergibus* ii 88, *modoque* ii 92, *igne* (nom.) ii 382, *prorem* ii 554, *adepto* ii 1133, *tumulto* iii 834, *baratre* iii 955, *necessu est* iv 516, *hoc* iv 615, is iv 1154, *rapidis* v 892, *stirpes* v 34. Some of these I cannot bring myself to approve: *adepto* in ii 1133, for *adempto*, changes the sense; *tumulto*, Q* at iii 834, is due to *oris* in the next line; *necessu est* at iv 516 points to *necessust*; *hoc* iv 615 as an ablative of comparison is extremely doubtful; is iv 1154 I suggested tentatively in 1907; and *rapidis* v 892 of Sylla's dogs is absurd.

Diels prints some 80 conjectures of his own, not all of which he admits into his text. A cynic might say that the larger the number of attempts a critic makes, the more likely he is to hit the mark. The chances are all against the conjectural critic, and scholars have dealt harshly with the work of their predecessors. Thus Diels accepts five only of Lachmann's 50, and the writer thinks himself very fortunate in having nine of his proposals adopted. In gratitude therefore I wish that I could accept as many of his, but not one

of his 80 seems to me absolutely certain; as highly probable I would mention *tonguit* at ii 456, *secum te* at iv 1282 where Bernays has *se tecum*; as ingenious but dubious, *inibi* for *morbi* vi 663, *Tmari* vi 879; the ingenious arrangement of vi 972 with Voss' *fronde hac*; the brilliant *habitam* in the sense of *inhabitatam* in v 201, that is unfortunately unsupported and perhaps unsupportable. Plausible conjectures are *terrast* i 469 (where I should read *terraest*), *ut claustra* iv 81, *vellera* iv 140, *locis* vi 755, *potis his* vi 762. Impossible to my mind are *simili* in ii 381 (previously suggested by Shackle), *utrumque* ii 461, *sorde* ii 84, *subida* iv 1209, *pos sunt* iv 1252, *incolumet* v 61, *nativoque* v 66, *consumit* v 692, *inactae* v 1339, *intortum* vi 555. Impossible, it seems to me, are *quo de egimus* ii 926, *sic* v 1002, *rabiði* of thunder, v 1193, *inde* v 1190, *maria* vi 632, and *inpediant* vi 1064. As unnecessary changes I consider *variove* ii 825, *suppetiantur* ii 1148, *cupiunt* iv 1118, *e caligine* v 296; and *et lueris* in vi 800 I can not understand. Diels attacked anew the most desperate passages: iii 239 *recipit se posse*, iv 545 *volucres gelidis nocte hortis*, v 312 *si cumque*, vi 550 *res dura ubicumque*; and far from rejecting anything he pieces out fragmentary lines as in iii 475 where he writes *sinapi* for *inani*.

It was easy to overlook the work of others in the Germany of recent years and Diels has several times been anticipated in his conjectures: thus *Musae* in i 657 was advocated by Bignone in 1921, *vist* at iii 492 by Tohte, *videatur* iv 633 by Bergk, *tantast* iv 799 by the reviewer, *ambiens* v 396 by Reid, *rabies* v 1065 by Flor. 31, *refertum* v 1279 by Wakefield, *quidque* vi 29 by the reviewer, *ingratiis* vi 216 by Wakefield, *maeror* is vi 1259 by Forbiger. Many other emendations may or may not be correct, such as *Gai* i 50, *aciem* i 321, *tegmenta* iv 1125 and many more. But a conjecture is worth while if it stimulates activity in others; and even if Diels should be unable to convince his readers, yet his proposals may be the indirect occasion of new, and perhaps successful, attacks on textual difficulties.

Diels is generous in his recognition of the work of other scholars, and occasionally he differs from other post-Lachmannians in accepting old conjectures like *possidantur* of Haverkamp at i 390, *quire* at i 748 from F (lately approved by Pascal), *extra* ii 106 of Grasberger, *acris* ii 579 of Purmann, *nequeunt* ii 922 of Gifanius, *stata* v 1164 of Orelli. Of modern work he accepts *ignist* of Bockemüller at i 453, *ecum* vi and *statuas* of Munro at ii 42, 43 and he adopts many emendations long generally received, and others proposed by Reid, Fay, the very attractive conjecture *celata acta* by Orth at v 1160, and some by the reviewer.

The apparatus criticus is very full in giving all of the cor-

rections of the principal mss. and the conjectures of scholars since Lachmann. Little of consequence has escaped him and one can be confident of finding in this edition all significant proposals.

In the punctuation I have noted but two novelties: posset, enim in iii 790 after the analogy of vi 1277, and the uniting of iv 1125 to 1123 with transfer of 1124.

Diels has no sympathy with the shifting of paragraphs adopted by Brieger and Giussani; and he abhors lacunae, for all of which he provides stopgaps that at least make sense, even if their Lucretian quality is at times questionable. He transfers a few lines that have always been transferred and marks off a few places as dittographs.

The capitula were printed by Lachmann at the end of his edition and were omitted by all of his successors up to Bailey; but Diels, as the reviewer in 1917, has incorporated them, rubricated, in his text. I now think that Ernout was wise in printing them at the foot of the page, as, although they are valuable in interpretation, they were not written by the poet and are often inapplicable to the places where they stand.

In spite of these blemishes that I have perhaps detected on its fair surface the edition is the work of a master and one that goes far to sustain the eminence of Germany as the home of great scholars. It is one of the great books of German learning, a credit to the erudite editor, and indispensable to Lucretian scholars and highly useful to all Latinists.

W. A. MERRILL.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Italische Gräberkunde, Part 1, Friedrich von Duhn, in *Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1924. 688 pp. 35 plates.

Except for Peet's valuable book on "The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy and Sicily" there has so far been no general study of the prehistoric tombs of Italy. Particularly for the vast masses of material unearthed from the many Iron Age cemeteries the student has had to search the Italian excavation reports and the scattered studies that have appeared in various journals. It is peculiarly fortunate that the long needed study of the early cemeteries of Italy should have been made by a scholar who is at the same time historian and archæologist, who through fifty years of close association with Italian excavators and their work, as well as with archæological exploration in other lands, has a range of experience and a breadth of outlook that are unparalleled.

The work as planned is to comprise two volumes of which the first, which alone has appeared, deals with the tombs of the native population and the so-called "Italic" (that is Latin and Umbro-Sabellic) invaders. The second volume will discuss the tombs of the foreign stock—the Illyrian-Balkan races in the east, the Etruscans, the Greeks, the Carthaginians, and the Celts.

The first section deals with the primitive inhabitants of Italy before the coming of the so-called Italic races. Von Duhn objects to the familiar terms Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages on the ground that the use of metal is not in general a good criterion in dating graves in Italy. Though the coming of the Italic lake-dwellers is usually identified with the Bronze age, copper and, in rarer cases, bronze (see p. 26) were used at an earlier period in Italy, particularly in Tuscany, where copper and possibly tin were mined in very remote times. Von Duhn has shown that before the coming of the lake-dwellers the whole peninsula and the neighboring islands were fairly evenly populated by several different races, all of whom buried their dead. Two considerable groups among them can be distinguished by their burial rites, the Ligurians and the Siculi of ancient tradition, the former occupying the largest part of the mainland, the latter, a people who came from Africa, holding Sicily and Sardinia and a section of Southern Italy.

The bulk of the volume deals with the two "Italic" stems who invaded Italy from the north, the group that cremated their dead, identical with the Latin races, and the group that buried their dead, who formed the Umbro-Sabellic branch. The former, descendants of the lake-dwellers of Switzerland and North Italy, built on piles upon dry land villages that were closely modelled upon the earlier lake dwellings. Their pile villages, known under the convenient term *terremare*, appear in the Po valley in the second half of the second millennium before Christ, a period when the use of bronze had become general. A later stage of the same people is represented by early Iron Age cemeteries such as the one at Villanova which was the first to be thoroughly excavated and has given its name to the culture which it represents. The "Villanova" people crossed the Apennines and spread through the region later known as Etruria, through western Umbria and a small strip of Latium south of the Tiber. All through this district their cremation burials, the so-called *pozzo* graves, attest the coming of these strangers, at whose arrival the native population either disappeared or settled down to life under forms which the newcomers brought. They were the first founders of cities in Italy, and the settlements which they established became in later times the great city-states of Etruria and Latium. Like the pile-dwellers of the north, they seem to have lived at first a communistic life, the

extraordinary uniformity of their tomb accessories probably representing a similar uniformity in worldly possessions. Such a state continued, von Duhn suggests, until the coming of a ruling class, the Etruscans. The unity of culture between Etruria and part of Latium on which von Duhn insists as a result of the study of the graves is supported by much evidence in cults and name forms in the two regions. In the early Iron Age the Tiber was not a dividing line of importance.

The other group of Italic people who buried their dead—the Umbro-Sabellic branch—came into Italy decidedly later than the Latin group. Since so far no traces of them have come to light north of the Apennines, von Duhn thinks it probable that they proceeded directly from the Alps to the Apennines, spread through Umbria and the Sabine country, and came down into the Latin plain to Gabii, Rome, the Latin coast, and the adjoining Volscian hills. Other groups of the Umbro-Sabellic stock made their way to Samnium, whence, in a series of invasions that extended into the historical period, they descended to the rich Campanian coast. Because of inadequate excavations this branch of the Italic people is far less well known than the other. The rarity of imported objects makes the chronology of their tombs especially hard to determine, and such criteria as are secured seldom allow burials in the region to be dated before the seventh century. In general, however, von Duhn notes, the Umbro-Sabellic tribes are distinguished from the Latin by the much smaller interest shown in the cult of the dead. Von Duhn believes that the Umbro-Sabellic tribes had already acquired the rite of inhumation before they came to Italy. But with the absence of evidence for graves that can be assigned to an early date, is there not a possibility that they may at first have practised cremation, and have changed their custom as a result of contact with the primitive inhabitants of Italy, about whose fate after the invasion of the "Italic" peoples practically nothing is known?

The change from cremation to inhumation, which became general among the Latin branch in South Etruria and Latium in the ninth and eighth centuries B. C., von Duhn explains by contact with two different peoples—the Etruscans in the coast towns of Etruria and the Sabines in the inland towns of South Etruria and Latium. Here, and indeed at every other point where von Duhn touches upon the Etruscans, the difficulties are apparent in the arrangement by which the full discussion of the Etruscans is left to the second volume. He considers the "Sabine" fossa (or burial trench) graves of Latium, Veii, and Falerii, but he does not deal in this volume with the fossa graves of Tarquinii, which, except for the greater frequency of imported objects naturally to be expected on the coast, seem very

similar. It would seem possible that the whole culture represented by the fossa graves was due to a migration of Sabines like that of their Samnite kinsmen who invaded the Campanian coast in the south. In that case the coming of the Etruscans would be associated with the earliest chamber tombs. There is a further difficulty of arrangement in the fact that in regions where the Etruscans settled von Duhn omits all burial graves and discusses the cremation burials even when, as in the case of the Tomba del Duce at Vetulonia, he thinks they belong to Etruscans. Moreover in Sabine territory he discusses all burial graves. Thus the Barberini and Bernardini tombs of Praeneste are fully dealt with, while the contemporary Regulini Galassi tomb in Caere is reserved for the second volume. The institution of private property seems in one passage (p. 349) actually to be attributed to the Etruscans in regions where they lived, but the wealth of the tombs of Praeneste and of Monteleone in Umbria, (where the bronze chariot of the Metropolitan was found) is attributed to native landholders.

In the use of his material von Duhn has steadily the point of view of the historian, and his generalizations are of great interest. Though the details of the traditions, especially for the earliest times, are frequently untrustworthy, the evidence of the tombs tends to confirm the general outlines which ancient tradition gives us for the early history of Italy. "Die Überlieferung ist viel besser als moderne Hyperskepsis hat zulassen wollen," von Duhn says in his introduction. In spite of the extraordinary confirmation of Greek legends which prehistoric archaeology has provided in the last half century, scholars have been slow in giving up the theory long current that most early Italic and Roman legends are a fabrication of Greek men of learning, who were trying to provide the Italic peoples with a glorious past. Von Duhn's marshalling of a mass of evidence which has hitherto been unwieldy and hard to collect will prove of great value in demonstrating the underlying truth in Italian legendary material.

Especially for Rome the correspondence between tradition and archaeology is striking. The fact that earlier cremation graves are found in the Alban hills than in Rome is in accord with the tradition that Rome was founded after Alba and the similarity of the objects discovered supports the close relation which legend indicates for the two cities. The results of excavations have done nothing to discredit the ancient belief that the Palatine was Rome's first settlement. Its necropolis in the Forum, as yet excavated only in very small portions, von Duhn believes shows earlier forms than the neighboring hills, though he would not exclude the possibility of small contemporary settlements on the hills. The tradition that placed the graves of Romulus, Faustulus, and Hostius Hostilius in the Forum, the

custom of delivering funeral orations there, the ancient cult of Vulcan in the region are all in accord with the use of the Forum as a burial place (pp. 413 ff.). The numerous fossa graves which overlap the period of the pozzi are relics of the Sabines whose representative Numa is said to have forbidden that his body be burned. This suggestion, often made before, will probably meet with more general acceptance as a result of the mass of evidence which von Duhn presents in support of it. Scholars, who have of late years been disposed to accept the tradition that an Etruscan dynasty ruled at Rome, will now be more inclined to believe that there is truth in the legends of the earlier Sabine kings. It is to be regretted that Dall'Osso's interesting discoveries on Monte Mario were made too late to enable von Duhn to give us his interpretation of them.

In spite of its good index the book is not an easy one to use. For a single volume it is heavy and unwieldy. The maps showing where cemeteries have been found and the plates with drawings of burials, cinerary urns, and fibulae are hard to use with the text because of the inconspicuousness of references in the text and the lack of explanatory notes on plates and maps. More adequate illustrations and, wherever possible, photographs instead of drawings were much needed. But such lacks in the book are readily explained by the difficulties that attend the publication of scholarly work in Germany today, and one can rejoice that its publication was not delayed by the impossibility of illustrating it adequately. Von Duhn is altogether justified in the hope that he expresses that his study of the graves will extend the sure historical basis laid by the *Corpus of Latin Inscriptions*. Beside Nissen's invaluable *Italische Landeskunde*, which, as von Duhn notes, failed to make use of the evidence of tombs even to the extent that was possible in its day, the student of early Italian history and geography must now have von Duhn's work at his elbow.

LILY ROSS TAYLOR.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius, erklärt von MAX ROTHSTEIN. Erster Teil, Erstes und Zweites Buch, Zweite Auflage. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1920. 500 pp.

Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV. Iterum edidit CAROLUS HOSIUS. In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri, Lipsiae, MCMXXII. Pp. xxiii + 190. 80 cents.

These second editions of two well-known books may be mentioned together. The general character of Dr. ROTHSTEIN'S

copious commentary remains unchanged. It is still "conservative without being dull, fresh and illuminating without being fanciful" (A. J. P. XXI, 462). The first volume has grown from 423 to 500 pages, and now includes much new explanatory and illustrative matter. The discussion as to the definite Greek sources of Roman Elegy has been rewritten—but the matter remains as obscure as ever. *Te*, for *et*, ii, 8, 23, and *nomen*, for *gloria*, i. 7, 9, note, are rather disturbing misprints.

The new Teubner text is an anastatic reprint of the edition of 1911 (A. J. P. XXXIII, 330-336). It corrects a few misprints of the first edition, and makes a number of changes and additions in the apparatus criticus. The editor now agrees with Professor ULLMAN that *F* is derived from *A*, though he still assigns *A* to the 14th century. He makes very few changes in the text, but he now prints *uota*, for *nota*, i, 16, 2; *fata*, for *facta*, iv. 1, 71.

W. P. MUSTARD.

REMIGIO SABBADINI. *Giovanni da Ravenna, Insigne Figura d'Umanista (1343-1408). Da documenti inediti.* Como: Tipografia Editrice Ostinelli, 1924. xii + 258 pp. L. 40.

This first volume of a new series of 'Humanistic Studies' is of special interest, in that it reconstructs the career of a fourteenth-century scholar whose life and works have been almost entirely forgotten. Giovanni di Conversino da Ravenna was born in 1343, and died at Venice in 1408. He led a wandering life, as a teacher, at Ravenna, Florence, Venice, Padua, and half-a-dozen other places. Among his pupils were Secco Polenton, Pier Paolo Vergerio, Guarino da Verona and Vittorino da Feltre. As a child, he met Boccaccio, at Ravenna and at Florence, and from 1364 to 1374 he was a friend of Petrarch. In 1400 he was sent from Padua on a mission to Pope Boniface IX, at Rome. Professor SABBADINI's work is documented by copious extracts from unpublished MSS of Giovanni's writings, especially from his autobiography (*Rationarium Vitae*) and his Epistles. And he clinches the distinction between this Giovanni da Ravenna and another who has been much better known (Giovanni Malpaghini, employed as a copyist by Petrarch).

W. P. MUSTARD.

Velleius Paterculus, *Compendium of Roman History; Res Gestae Divi Augusti*; with an English translation by FREDERICK W. SHIPLEY. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924. xx + 431 pp.

To the professional student of Latin, the most interesting volumes of the Loeb Classical Library are those which are devoted to the less important or less familiar authors. A case in point is Professor SHIPLEY's edition of Velleius Paterculus. This is an excellent piece of work. I hesitate to say "an excellent translation," because a good translation is supposed to reproduce something of the style or tone of the original, and in this case the English is much better, and much more readable, than the Latin. But, after all, Velleius is important as history, not as literature, and no sane person wants a reproduction of his style. The student of history—even the expert Latin scholar—will be grateful for this reliable interpretation of the meaning. As a sort of appendix, the volume includes a good study of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*.

W. P. MUSTARD.

CORRESPONDENCE.

For some years a group of distinguished Italian scholars have been engaged in preparing a "national edition" of the complete works of Petrarch. It is now pleasant to announce that arrangements for publication have been practically completed, and that the first volume may actually be issued early in 1925. The publisher will be the Casa Editrice Sansoni, of Florence. There will be some 18 or 19 volumes, of about 500 pages each. The price has not been definitely fixed, but it will probably be about 100 lire a volume. The first volume will very appropriately be devoted to the *Africa*, edited by Prof. NICOLA FESTA, of the University of Rome. This is to be followed by several volumes of the Latin letters, prepared by Prof. VITTORIO ROSSI, also of the University of Rome. Other editors engaged are Senator PIO RAJNA, Prof. E. CARRARA, Prof. F. ERMINI, etc. Such names are a sufficient guarantee of the quality of the work, and of its importance to our American libraries.

W. P. MUSTARD.

ERRATUM.

On p. 256, n. 22, line 4, the printer inadvertently substituted ελος for ελος.—C. W. E. M.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Selected Bindings from the Gennadius Library. Thirty-Eight Plates in Color. With Introduction and descriptions by Lucy Allen Paton. Made and printed in Great Britain. Published by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1924. 4°.

Bérard (Victor). Introduction à L'Odyssée. Tome 1. L'Épos homérique; Le poème représenté. Paris, Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1924. 460 pp. 12°. 25 francs.

British Academy, Proceedings, Vol. XI, 1923-24. Haldane (Richard Burdon): Bernard Bosanquet, 1824-1923. Mackail (J. W.): Bentley's Milton. Poole (Reginald L.): The Early Correspondence of John of Salisbury. Pringle-Pattison (A. S.): The Philosophy of History. Tout (T. F.): The Beginnings of a Modern Capital (London and Westminster in the Fourteenth Century).

Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit. Hrg. von den Akademien der Wissenschaften in München und Wien. Reihe A: Regesten. Abt. 1: Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches, bearbeitet von Franz Dölger. 1. Teil: Regesten von 565-1025. München und Berlin, R. Oldenbourg, 1924. Pp. xxix + 105. 4°.

Dennis (Holmes Van Mater, 3d). Hippo Regius from the Earliest Times to the Arab Conquest. Princeton University dissertation. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1924. Pp. 74. 8°.

Devoto (Giacomo). Adattamento e distinzione nella fonetica latina. Firenze, Felice le Monnier. Pp. xii + 132, 8°.

Diehl (Ernestus). Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres. fasc. 2-3. Berlin, Weidmann, 1924. Pp. 81-240, 8°. Each fasc. M. 3.75.

Frank (Tenney). Roman Buildings of the Republic. An Attempt to Date them from their Materials. American Academy in Rome, 1924. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. III.) Pp. 149, 8°.

Franklin (Benjamin). The Life of, written by himself. Edited from his Original Manuscript by John Bigelow. London, Humphrey Milford; New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch. (The World's Classics, 250.) Pp. lxx + 247, 16°. \$80.

Giannelli (Giulio). La spedizione di Serse da Terme a Salamina. Milano, Società editrice "Vita e Pensiero." (Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Serie quinta, Scienze Storiche, Vol. V.) 80 pp. 8°.

Glover (T. R.) Herodotus. Berkeley, Cal., The University of California Press, 1924. Pp. xv + 301, 8°.

Goldsmith (William M.) Evolution or Christianity; God or Darwin? St. Louis, Mo., and Winfield, Kansas, The Anderson Press, 1924. Pp. 144. 12°. \$50.

Griswold (H. D.) The Religion of the Rigveda. (The Religious Quest of India Series.) New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1923. Pp. xxiv + 392, 8°. \$4.20.

Gudeman (Alfred). Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur. Berlin

und Leipzig, *Walter de Gruyter & Co.*, 1923. 2 vols., 120, 148 pp. 16°. (Sammlung Götschen.)

Hamilton (Alfred Porter). *Compounds of the Word, "Cow."* A Study in Semantics. University of Pennsylvania dissertation. Philadelphia, 1923. Pp. 59, 8°.

Harrer (G. A.) *The Site of Cicero's Villa at Arpinum.* (Reprinted from *Studies in Philology*, XXI, 4, October, 1924, pp. 541-570.)

Hazlitt (William). *Lectures on the English Poets.* London, *Humphrey Milford*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch.* (The World's Classics, 255.) Pp. 256, 16°. \$80.

Hibbard (Laura A.) *Mediaeval Romance in England. A Study of the Sources and Analogues of the Non-cyclic Metrical Romances.* New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. viii + 342, 8°. \$3.50.

Hinnisdaels (Georges). *L'Octavius de Minucius Felix et L'Apologétique de Tertullien.* Bruxelles, *Marcel Hayez*, 1924. Pp. 139, 8°.

Homère, *L'Odyssée.* Tome I: Chants I-VII. Texte établi et traduit par Victor Bérard. Paris, *Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres,"* 1924. Twice 199 pp. 12°. 25 frs.

Horace. *Oeuvres d'Horace.* Texte latin avec un commentaire critique et explicatif des introductions et des tables par F. Plessis, P. Lejay et E. Galletier. Odes, Épodes et Chant séculaire, publiés par Frédéric Plessis. Paris, *Librairie Hachette*, 1924. Pp. lxxvii + 396, 8°. 35 francs.

Howe (George) and Harrer (Gustave Adolphus). *Roman Literature in Translation.* New York and London, *Harper & Brothers*, 1924. Pp. xiv + 630, 8°. \$4.00.

Inter-America. English: Volume VIII, No. 1, October 1924. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Company.*

Jaeger (Werner). *Stellung und Aufgaben der Universität in der Gegenwart.* Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1924. Pp. 27, 8°. M. —.80.

Kromayer (Johannes). *Antike Schlachtfelder. Bausteine zu einer antiken Kriegsgeschichte.* Vierter Band: Schlachtfelder aus den Perserkriegen; aus der späteren griechischen Geschichte und den Feldzügen Alexanders und aus der römischen Geschichte bis Augustus von J. Kromayer u. G. Veith. 1. Lieferung. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1924. Pp. 170, 8°. M. 7.50.

Lehman (Linwood). *Quantitative Implications of the Pyrrhic Stress, especially in Plautus and Terence.* University of Virginia, 1924. 81 pp., 8°.

Mahā Bhāratha (The) in English. Part I (containing the first ten Parvas). By K. S. Seshagiri Iyer. Mylapore, 1924. Pp. 95, 16°. 10 Annas.

Manning (Clarence A.) *Language and International Affairs.* (Reprinted from the July number of *The Sewanee Review*, 1924, pp. 1-19.)

Newhall (Jane Peers). *The Lyric Portions of Two Dramas of Euripides, Iphigenia at Aulis, Iphigenia among the Taurians.* Set to Music. (Smith College Classical Studies, No. 5, June, 1924.) Pp. 49.

Shakespeare, *Othello, the Moor of Venice.* Edited by C. H. Herford; American edition revised by Raymond M. Alden. New York, London., D. C. Heath and Company, 1924. (The Arden Shakespeare.) Pp. xlii + 176, 16°.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). A New English Dictionary, edited by Sir James A. H. Murray, etc. Vol. X. Ti-Z. UNFORESEEING-UN-

RIGHT. By W. A. Craigie. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, June 1924. \$3.50.

Ovid. P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus. Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary, by S. G. Owen. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. x + 296. \$7.00.

Patrick (George Z.). Étude morphologique et syntaxique des verbes dans Maistre Pierre Pathelin. Berkeley, *University of California Press*. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 287-379, June 30, 1924.)

Personalist (The). Vol. V, No. 4. October 1924. Los Angeles, *University of Southern California*. Yearly subscription, \$2.00.

Philological Quarterly, Vol. III, October 1924, No. 4. Published at the *University of Iowa*, Iowa City, Iowa.

Plato's Euthyphro, Apology of Socrates, and Crito. Edited with Notes by John Burnet. New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. Pp. vii + Greek text + 220 pp., notes, 12°. \$2.85.

Rand (Edward Kennard). The Quentin's Memoir on the Text of the Vulgate. Reprinted from The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XVII, No. 3, July, 1924, pp. 197-264.

Reitzenstein (Erich). Theophrast bei Epikur und Lucrez. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1924. (Orient und Antike, 2.) Pp. 108, 8°.

Rostrup (Egill). Attic Tragedy in the Light of Theatrical History. Translated by Ingeborg Andersen. Kristiania, London, Berlin, *Gyldendalske Boghandel, Nordisk Forlag*, 1923. Pp. 166, 8°.

Rudberg (Gunnar). Kring Platons Phaidros. Göteborg, *Eranos' Förlag*, 1924. (Svenskt Arkiv för Humanistiska Avhandlingar, 1.) Pp. 166, 8°. 6 Kronor.

Smyth (Herbert Weir). Aeschylean Tragedy. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1924. Pp. vii + 234, 8°. Cloth, \$3.50, postpaid.

Tegnér (E.). Fritiof's Sage. Translated in the Original Metres by C. D. Locock. New York, *The Macmillan Company*, 1924. Pp. 140, 12°.

Titchener (John Bradford). The Manuscript-Tradition of Plutarch's *Aetia Graeca* and *Aetia Romana*. Urbana, *The University of Illinois*. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. IX, No. 2, May 1924.) 68 pp. 8°.

University of Wales. Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies. Vol. II, Part II. May, 1924. London, *Oxford University Press*; New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*. Price \$2.50.

Velde (Rein van der). Thessalische dialektgeographie. Doctoral Diss. Nijmegen, Utrecht, N. V. Dekker & Van de Vegt en J. W. Van Leeuwen, 1924. Pp. xii + 182, 8°.

Vollgraff (C. W.). ΕΠΙΦΩΣ ΕΣ ΓΑΛ' ΕΠΕΤΟΝ (Over den oorsprong der dionysische mysteriën). (= Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Deel 57, Serie A, No. 2.) Amsterdam, 1924. Pp. 35, 8°.

Walker (J.). The Rhyming Dictionary of the English Language in which the whole language is arranged according to its terminations. Revised and enlarged by Lawrence H. Dawson. London, *George Routledge & Sons, Ltd.*; New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.* Pp. vii + 549, small 8°.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulrich v.). Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos. 2 Bände. Pp. viii + 244 + 338. M. 18.

INDEX TO VOLUME XLV.

- Aeneas' City at the Mouth of the Tiber, 64-67
- Aeneid, On Some Theories Concerning the Composition of, 260-275
- I, 599, *Exhaustis* or *Exhaustos*, 179-181
- IV, 551: More Ferae, 176-178
- Aeschylus, Agamemnon, A Suggested Emendation for Line 1459, 72
- Agamemnon, The Metrical Arrangement of the Κομὸς in the, 70-71
- ANDERSON, FLORENCE M. B. A Suggested Emendation for Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, Line 1459, 72
- The Metrical Arrangement of the Κομὸς in the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, 70-71
- Archæological Studies, Philological and, 238-259
- Aristotelian Theory of Comedy, An, Cooper's (rev.), 293-296
- Aristotle's 'Rhetoric,' Notes on, 351-361
- Armenian Version of Plato's Laws and Minos, 105-140
- Athenian Generals of the Year 424-423 B. C., 141-160
- Bantu Notes, 76-77
- BENDER, HAROLD H. Review of Būga's Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, 198-199
- Books Received, 101-104; 199-204; 300; 398-400
- Caesura, The Doctrine of, A Philological Ghost, 329-350
- CLARK, CHARLES U. Review of Lowe and Rand's Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger, 88-90
- COFFMAN, GEORGE R. Correspondence, 96
- Comedy, An Aristotelian Theory of (rev.), 293-296
- CONYBEARE, FRED C. On the Armenian Version of Plato's Laws and Minos, 105-140
- Correspondence, 94-96; 96; 397
- DEWITT, NORMAN W. Aeneid IV, 551: More Ferae, 176-178
- DeWitt's Virgil's Biographia Litteraria (rev.), 91-92
- Doctrine of Caesura, A Philological Ghost, 329-350
- Early Latin Verse, Lindsay's (rev.), 296-299
- EBELING, HERMAN L. Report of Hermes, 78-82; 284-288; 380-383
- EDGERTON, FRANKLIN. The Meaning of Sāṅkhyā and Yoga, 1-46
- Erratum, 397
- Exhaustis* or *Exhaustos*, Aeneid I, 599, 179-181
- FRANK, TENNEY. Aeneas' City at the Mouth of the Tiber, 64-67
- Latin Quantitative Speech as Affected by Immigration, 161-175
- The Letters on the Blocks of the Servian Wall, 68-69
- Review of Dessau's Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit, 192-194
- Janell's P. Vergili Maronis Opera, 90-91
- Galen's De sanitate tuenda, etc. (rev.), 194-195
- Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit, Dessau's (rev.), 192-194
- Gildersleeve, Basil Lanneau, Memorial Notice of, 97-100
- Giovanni da Ravenna, Sabbadini's (rev.), 396
- HAUPT, PAUL. Philological Studies, 47-63
- Philological and Archæological Studies, 238-259
- HEIDEL, W. H. Vergil's Messianic Expectations, 205-237
- Review of Galen's De sanitate tuenda, etc., 194-195

- Hellenen und Barbaren, Juethner's (rev.), 189-192
Hermes, Report of, 78-82;
284-288; 380-383
HIRST, GERTRUDE. Notes on
Juvenal, I, III, VI, X,
276-283
History of Magic and Experimental Science, Thorndyke's (rev.), 93
HYDE, WALTER W. Review of
Juethner's Hellenen und
Barbaren, 189-192
Hyde's Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic
Art (rev.), 85-88
Indefinite First Singular, The,
377-379
Index, 401-404
Italische Gräberkunde, Duhn's
(rev.), 391-395
Janell's P. Vergili Maronis
Opera (rev.), 90-91
JOHNSON, HELEN. Notes on
the Rāuhineyacaritra, 73-75
Juvenal, I, III, VI, X, Notes
on, 276-283
KEIDEL, GEORGE C. Report of
Romania, 83-85; 383-387
KIRK, W. H. Aeneid I, 599,
Exhaustis or *Exhaustos*,
179-181
LAING, GORDON J. Review of
Adams' A Study in the
Commerce of Latium,
291-292
Latin Quantitative Speech as
Affected by Immigration,
161-175
L'Etna Poème, Vessereau's
(rev.), 93-94
Letters on the Blocks of the
Servian Wall, 68-69
Lietuvių kalbos žodynas,
Būga's (rev.), 198-199
Lucan's Pharsalia, 301-328
Lucretius' De Rerum Natura,
Diels's (rev.), 387-391
MALONE, KEMP. Ptolemy's
Skandia, 362-370
Map's De Nugis Curialium,
Tupper and Ogle's (rev.),
195-196
MERRILL, W. A. Review of
Diels's Lucretius' De
Rerum Natura, 387-391
Messianic Expectations, Vergil's,
205-237
Metrical Arrangement of the
Κομμός in the *Agamemnon*
of Aeschylus, 70-71
MILLER, C. W. E. Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, 97-100
MUSTARD, WILFRED P. Correspondence, 397
Report of *Rivista di Filologia*,
182-184; 288-290
Reviews:
Bourgery's Sènèque, Dialogues, Tome II, 196-197
DeWitt's Virgil's Biographia Litteraria, 91-92
Hosius' Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV, 396
Johnson's Francisci Petrarcae Epistolae Selectae, 197-198
Rothstein's Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius, 395-396
Sabbadini's Giovanni da Ravenna, 396
Shipley's Velleius Paterculus, 397
Thorndyke's History of Magic and Experimental Science, 93
Tupper and Ogle's Map's De Nugis Curialium, 195-196
Vessereau's L'Etna Poème, 93-94
Notes on Aristotle's 'Rhetoric,' 351-361
on Certain Athenian Generals of the Year 424-423 B. C., 141-160
on Juvenal, I, III, VI, X, 276-283
on the Rāuhineyacaritra, 73-75
NUTTING, H. C. The Indefinite First Singular, 377-379
OGLE, M. B. On Some Theories Concerning the Composition of the Aeneid, 260-275
Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art, Hyde's (rev.), 85-88

- PEPPLER, CHARLES W. Review of Cooper's *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy*, 293-296
- Petrarch, Italian 'national edition' of, 397
- Petrarchae (Francisci) *Epistolae Selectae*, Johnson's (rev.), 197-198
- Philological Studies, 47-63
- and Archæological Studies, 238-259
- Platonic Epistles, A Supposed Historical Discrepancy in, 371-376
- Plato's Laws and Minos, On the Armenian Version of, 105-140
- Post, L. A. A Supposed Historical Discrepancy in the Platonic Epistles, 371-376
- Propertii *Elegiarum Libri IV*, Hosius' (rev.), 396
- Propertius, Rothstein's (rev.), 395-396
- Ptolemy's *Skandia*, 362-370
- Rāuhīneyacaritra, Notes on the, 73-75
- Reports:
- Hermes, 78-82; 284-288; 380-383
- Revue de Philologie, 184-188
- Rivista di Filologia, 182-184; 288-290
- Romania, 83-85; 383-387
- Reviews:
- Adams, A Study in the Commerce of Latium, 291-292
- Bourgery's and Waltz's *Sénèque, Dialogues*, 196-197
- Būga's *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, 198-199
- Cooper's *An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy*, 293-296
- Dessau's *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, 192-194
- DeWitt's *Virgil's Biographia Litteraria*, 91-92
- Diels's *Lucretius' De Rerum Natura*, 387-391
- Hartlich's, Helmreich's, Kalbfleisch's, Koch's *Galen's De Sanitate*, etc., 194-195
- Hosius' *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV*, 396
- Hyde's *Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art*, 85-88
- Janell's *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 90-91
- Johnson's *Francisci Petrarcae Epistolae Selectae*, 197-198
- Juethner's *Hellenen und Barbaren*, 189-192
- Lindsay's *Early Latin Verse*, 296-299
- Lowe and Rand's *Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger*, 88-90
- Rothstein's *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius*, 395-396
- Sabbadini's *Giovanni da Ravenna*, 396
- Shipley's *Velleius Paterculus*, 397
- Thorndyke's *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, 93
- Tupper and Ogle's *Map's De Nugis Curialium*, 195-196
- Vessereau's *L'Etna Poème*, 93-94
- Von Duhn's *Italische Gräberkunde*, 391-395
- Revue de Philologie, 184-188
- Rivista di Filologia, 182-184; 288-290
- ROBERTS, W. RHYS. Notes on Aristotle's 'Rhetoric,' 351-361
- Romania, Report of, 83-85; 383-387
- Sāṅkhya and Yoga, The Meaning of, 1-46
- Sénèque, *Dialogues*, Bourgery's and Waltz's (rev.), 196-197
- Servian Wall, Letters on the Blocks of the, 68-69
- SHEAR, T. LESLIE. Review of Hyde's *Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art*, 85-88
- Sixth-Century Fragment of the Letters of Pliny the Younger*, Lowe and Rand's (rev.), 88-90
- Skandia*, Ptolemy's, 362-370
- Some Theories Concerning the Composition of the *Aeneid*, On, 260-275

- | | | | |
|---|---------|--|---------|
| STEELE, R. B. Lucan's Pharsalia, | 301-328 | Velleius Paterculus, Shipley's (rev.), | 397 |
| Study in the Commerce of Latium, Adams' (rev.), | 291-292 | Vergil, Aeneid I, 599, | 179-181 |
| STURTEVANT, EDGAR H. The Doctrine of Caesura, A Philological Ghost, | 329-350 | Aeneid IV, 551, | 176-178 |
| Supposed Historical Discrepancy in the Platonic Epistles, | 371-376 | Vergili Maronis Opera, Jannell's (rev.), | 90-91 |
| TAYLOR, GILBERT H. Review of Lindsay's Early Latin Verse, | 296-299 | Vergil's Aeneid, Composition of, | 260-275 |
| TAYLOR, LILY ROSS. Review of von Duhn's Italische Gräberkunde, | 391-395 | Biographia Litteraria, De Witt's (rev.), | 91-92 |
| Thorndyke's History of Magic and Experimental Science (rev.), | 93 | Messianic Expectations, | 205-237 |
| Tiber, Aeneas' City at the Mouth of, | 64-67 | WEST, ALLEN B. Notes on Certain Athenian Generals of the Year 424-3 B. C., | 141-160 |
| TUTTLE, EDWIN H. Bantu Notes, | 76-77 | WHEELER, A. L. Correspondence, | 94-96 |
| | | WIGHT, CAROL V. B. Report of Revue de Philologie, | 184-188 |
| | | Yoga, The Meaning of Sāṅkhya and, | 1-46 |

97
81
78

91

75

92

37

30

96

88

46

STUDIES IN THE RENAISSANCE PASTORAL

Latin Texts, edited, with Introductions and Notes,

By WILFRED P. MUSTARD,

Professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University.

8vo, cloth.

- I. **The Eclogues of Baptista Mantuanus (1911).** Pp. 156.
\$1.50.

The introduction treats of the life of Mantuan, his family and friends, his works, his popularity, the wide use of his Eclogues as a school-book, and their influence upon Sixteenth Century literature. The notes are mainly devoted to the poet's use of his great classical models.

- II. **The Piscatory Eclogues of Jacopo Sannazaro (1914).**
Pp. 94. \$1.25.

These are very clever imitations, or adaptations, of some of Virgil's Bucolics. The Virgilian conventions are so far modified that the pastoral eclogue becomes a piscatory eclogue, or an idyll of fishermen.

- III. **The Eclogues of Faustus Andrelinus and Joannes Arnolletus (1918).** Pp. 123. \$1.50.

"One of the Italian scholars who helped to spread the New Learning in France, professor for many years in the University of Paris, the intimate friend of Erasmus, the special protégé of the King and Queen—*diu regnavit Lutetiae*."

- IV. **The Eclogues of Antonio Geraldini (1924).** Pp. 84. \$1.50.

"The main subject of the poems is the story of the Life of Christ. The last three deal with the Apostles' Creed, the Last Judgment, and the Life of the Blessed in the Hereafter. One interesting feature is their free use of the language and imagery of Ovid."

MARTIAL, THE EPIGRAMMATIST, AND OTHER ESSAYS.

By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

180 pages. 16mo. \$2.00.

Selections from Professor Smith's less technical papers, revised and edited by W. P. Mustard. Contents: Martial, the Epigrammatist, The Poet Ovid, Propertius: a Modern Lover in the Augustan Age, Pupula Duplex, the Classics and our Vernacular, the Future Place of the Humanities in Education, Some Boyhood Reminiscences of a Country Town, Original Verse and Translations.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Baltimore, Maryland

